

Caucasia and Byzantium

by Cyril Toumanoff

Published in the journal *Traditio* 27(1971), pp. 111-158.

Maps appear as an attachment to the present document.

[Caucasia and Byzantium](#)

[Appendix A](#)

Armenian and Georgian Commanding Officers in the Armed Forces of the Empire in the Reign of Justinian I, 527-565

[Appendix B](#)

Armenians and Georgians in the Imperial Service, from the end of the Justinianic to the End of the Basilid Epoch (VIth-XIth Centuries)

[Appendix C](#)

Heraclian Onomastics

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

CAUCASIA AND BYZANTIUM*

By CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Perhaps not unnaturally, but disastrously for itself, Byzantine historiography has so far, if at all, tended to view the role played by the Caucasians, especially Armenians, in the history of the Eastern Empire with somewhat parochial, or microcosmic, eyes.¹ To those eyes, Armenia, and Caucasia in general, remain largely a *terra incognita*, despite occasional inroads into that unknown territory. Thus, even when, as of late, the importance of, especially, the Armenian element for Byzantine history has at last been recognized, insufficient acquaintance with the historical, cultural, and social background of the part of the world where that element originated and whence it came to the Empire is nevertheless still too much in evidence.² And yet, precisely

The thesis of the present study was presented in a nucleal form as Main Paper XIII: 'The Background to Mantzikert,' read at the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, at Oxford in September 1966.

¹ A notable exception, and a surprisingly early one, is F. W. Bussell. Part II of the second volume of his *The Roman Empire: Essays on the Constitutional History from the Accession of Domitian (81 A.D.) to the Retirement of Nicephorus III. (1081 A.D.)* (London 1910), entitled 'Armenia and Its Relations with the Empire (520-1120): The Predominance of the Armenian Element,' though containing much that is unfounded, hasty, and at present outmoded, nevertheless manifests what amounts to an inspired attempt to see Caucasia from *within*, as it were, not merely as Byzantium's hazy outside world, and to see it especially under its social aspect, relating then what has thus been seen to the activities of the Caucasian element within the Empire. This is the more remarkable when one considers that his was not a first-hand acquaintance with Caucasia.

² Even *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire* of P. Charanis (Lisbon 1963), the latest and in many respects the fullest presentation of the subject, and one which can be said to have made amends for previous neglect—it completes the author's earlier 'Ethnic Changes in the Byzantine Empire in the Seventh Century,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 13 (1959) 23-44—displays nevertheless a total lack of acquaintance with the Caucasian social background. Passing over the use in this book of the word 'chieftain' to designate members of the dynastic stratum of the highly evolved Armenian social structure, one may single out the veritable *tour de force* of never once mentioning by name the Bagratid Dynasty, even when the context most emphatically requires a reference to that illustrious name (e.g. pp. 31, 46, 48). Of course, Armenian scholars have long combined a knowledge of the Caucasian background with a realization of the importance of the Armenians in Byzantium; and in this connection the name of Nicholas Adontz is one that first springs to the mind. It was only in the late 1920s, however, that he began writing in French, instead of in Armenian or in Russian as before, thus making the results of his research easily available to the Byzantine scholars of the West. Complementing, in the domain of the history of art, his contribution, is that of Sirarpie Der Nersessian, whose general work, *Armenia and the Byzantine*

because of the importance for Byzantine history of the element in question, its background ought to be of interest to the Byzantine scholar, for it alone can fully explain the nature of the role which was played by that element. This is precisely the scope of this study: not merely to repeat what has at last been admitted, but also to supplement it and bring it into focus; in other words, to describe the background in order more fully to explain the role.

This is actually a rewarding study, for the *terra incognita*, so far from being a *tabula rasa*, is an area of ancient, rich, and original civilization. We must begin by defining our terms. If Armenia and Caucasia have so far been spoken of interchangeably, it is so because I include Armenia in the world of Caucasia. This world can be described as the north-easternmost part of the Mediterranean world, situated south of the Caucasus range, bulging out southwards and contained by a near-circle formed by the Black Sea, Anatolia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Iran, and the Caspian Sea. It has been perennially shared by two principal nations, the Armenians and the Georgians; and, in the past, also by the Caspian Albanians since submerged by Islam. Armenia and Georgia have formed a definite historical, cultural, and social unity, a unity which has been enhanced by Christianity and remained distinct from the neighboring areas. This unity and individuality constitute a *fait accompli* of history and cannot be expunged from it by any subsequent denominational or nationalistic disagreements. It is, then, this unity and individuality that are denoted by one comprehensive name which is Caucasia.³

Together with the civilizations of the West and of Byzantium, Caucasian Civilization is an heir of an earlier unity, pan-Mediterranean Christian Civilization. Its roots, however, go further back into the past, especially to three of the local cultures of which that unity was a synthesis, Anatolian, Mesopotamian, and Aegean;⁴ its earliest manifestation was the so-called Cyro-Araxan Chalcolithic Culture of possibly the fourth, or at any rate of the begin-

Empire (Harvard University Press 1947), ought to be mentioned here. But how little these opportunities have been profited by, becomes clear on comparing, e.g., the space allotted to the Caucasian element in the best-known general histories of Byzantium with that accorded to, say, the Slavic element, which has contributed nothing to Byzantine Civilization. But cf. E. Stein, 'Introduction à l'histoire et aux institutions byzantines,' *Traditio* 7 (1949-1951) 158-61 (and 97: 'Rien de l'histoire médiévale tant de l'Occident que de l'Orient ne devrait être tout à fait étranger à celui qui étudie Byzance'); also my 'Caucasia and Byzantine Studies,' *ibid.* 12 (1956) 409-11.

³ See, for the problem of Caucasian unity, my *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Georgetown University Press 1963) I: 'The Social Background of Christian Caucasia' pp. 13-144. — To be sure, 'Christian Caucasia' or, better still, 'Cis-Caucasia,' would be more exact as a name; but since it is unwieldy, and 'Trans-Caucasia' in addition to being equally unwieldy is also incorrect historically, 'Caucasia' must suffice; cf. *ibid.* 11-12 and n. 1.

⁴ Cf. *Studies* 48-9, 55-9.

ning of the third millennium B.C.;⁵ while its first important political and social formation was achieved between the ninth and the sixth century B.C. in the Monarchy of Urartu and, from perhaps as early as the second millennium until the first century B.C., in the Monarchy of Aea-Colchis.⁶ Like the rest of the East Mediterranean world, Caucasia then passed through successive phases of cultural, social, and political syncretism, as part of the *pax achaemenica*, of the *pax macedonica*, and of the *pax romana*. Lastly, together with the Romano-Hellenistic world, it shared in the unity of the *pax christiana*, of Christendom.

After the parting of the ways, brought about in the mid-third century by the neo-Achaemenian revolution of the Sassanids, between the Iranian and the Romano-Hellenistic world, Caucasia remained outside both Rome, then New Rome, and New Iran. But it was claimed by both. And its absorption by either one was precluded by the equipoise of their incessant rivalry over it, which, though it did not exclude the exercise of political control in it by either power, did in fact ensure its survival as an autonomous society. The political control claimed, or achieved, over Caucasia by these two adjacent empires was of different kinds: it could be either suzerainty or sovereignty resulting from annexation. Accordingly, the Caucasian lands were either vassal States or integral provinces of one or the other of the rival empires; and the former might on occasion be subjected to annexation, while the latter might gain autonomy. Iran, on the whole, remained content with the exercise of suzerainty, while the Roman Empire and especially its Eastern successor State invariably tended, whenever possible, to replace suzerain-vassal relations by annexation.⁷

⁵ Traces of Palaeolithic man, as ancient as any other earliest known traces of human life on earth, have been discovered in Caucasia during the present century; as well as ample Neolithic remains (of the fifth-fourth millennium B.C.). For this, as well as for the succeeding Cyro-Araxan Chalcolithic Culture, see, e.g., D. M. Lang, *The Georgians* (New York/Washington 1966) 23-53 (and the bibliography, 180-89), which is by far the most valuable part of this small book.

⁶ *Studies* 50-54, 55-58.

⁷ This difference stemmed from the constitutional difference between the two polities. For all its claims to autocracy and cosmocracy, the Iranian Crown was limited by two constitutional factors: the existence of an official nobility and that of vassal States. The East Roman Empire, on the other hand, had no such official deterrents to both autocracy and cosmocracy. The Emperor was assisted by an officialdom and not delimited by a nobility, and all foreign monarchs, if within reach and yet allowed to exist, derived their existence as monarchs, in Roman eyes, from the legal fiction of being the Emperor's officials. In these circumstances, it was quite natural to prefer to see this legal fiction replaced by corresponding reality. Cf. *infra* at n. 128.

The rivalry of Rome and Iran over Caucasia was actually quite inevitable, and its causes lay deep in the past. It stemmed at once from a juridical and a practical incompatibility between the respective claims. Juridically, there was the fact that Caucasia had been part of the Achaemenid empire and that, on the other hand, it had subsequently accepted the suzerainty of Rome. Practically, there was the fact that it was necessary to both. Caucasia formed a great natural fortress between the two empires from which each of the rivals could control the delicate frontier-line that lay between them in the south. From it, each could strike at the other's sensitive points, Ctesiphon, the 'Roman Lake,' later, Constantinople. From it, finally, each could control the defences of the Caucasian passes, so as to protect the civilized world south of the range or else open them to let the hyperborean barbarian from beyond attack the territories of the other. The Sassanian *renovatio* of Iran added new sharpness to this rivalry. Unlike their Arsacid predecessors, the Sassanid Great Kings would accept no compromise with Rome over Caucasia. The dual control over Armenia, and the rest of Caucasia, inaugurated A.D. 63, when an Arsacid prince had received the crown of Armenia from Nero,⁸ was no longer feasible. In the eyes of the Caucasian Courts, where the Arsacid tradition was strong, the Sassanids were usurpers;⁹ and then, while New Iran was committed to the exclusivist religion of Mazdaism, the Caucasian kingdoms soon accepted, almost simultaneously with the Roman Empire, another no less exclusive religion, Christianity. In this way, a new bond linked Caucasia to Rome and a new gulf separated it from Iran. Thus, the struggle between the empires continued.

When, in the seventh century, the Sassanid Monarchy fell, its heritage passed to the Islamic empire of the Caliphs; and this implied but little change for Caucasia which, having been fought over by Rome and Iran, continued to be fought over by Byzantium and Islam. No more than the Great King of old, could the Caliph acquiesce in the Emperor's rival influence in it. When, next, the Caliphate had grown weak and the Empire's attention was engaged else-

⁸ For the Treaty of Rhandea and the coronation of Tiridates I in Rome three years later: Tacitus, *Annales* 15.24-31; 16.23-24; Suetonius, *Nero* 13; Cassius Dio 62.22-3; 63 (62).1-7; cf. Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 30.6.1; 33.16; cf. R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie* (Paris 1947) 108-9; N. C. Debevoise, *A Political History of Parthia* (Chicago 1938) 193-6.

⁹ The Armenian historical tradition—the Agathangelus and Ps. Moses of Chorene 2.67-75—and the Iberian—Leontius of Ruissi, *History of the Kings of Iberia* (ed. S. Qauxç'išvili, *K'a-t'i-lis C'xovreba* I [Tiflis 1955] 59, 60-1)—speak of a coalition attempted against the first Sassanid Artasir by the Arsacid King of Armenia; cf. also Grousset, *Histoire*, 113-4. On their part, Cassius Dio 80.3.1-3, and Zonaras 12.15, mention the defeat of Artasir in Armenia, at the hands of the Armenians, some Medes, and the sons of the last Arsacid Great King. The neo-Achaemenian claims of Sassanid Iran are well summed up by Cassius Dio 80.3.4, and Herodian 6.2, 4.

where, Caucasian Civilization entered a phase of particular brilliance, which lasted from the ninth to the eleventh century. But, by the mid-eleventh century, the absence of adequate counterpoise had evoked Byzantium's inherent annexationism. The result was the destruction of Armenia and the momentary weakening of Georgia, which paved the way for the success of the most vigorous of the Caliph's *Diadochi* — the Seljuqs. This success spelled the Byzantine disaster of 1071, following which Byzantium lost its imperial character and became Balkanized, and the influx of the Caucasians into it was terminated.

*
*
*

It may be well to deepen here and there this rather sketchy outline of the Caucasian background, while examining the geography involved. The first Armenian land to be annexed by the Empire was Lesser Armenia. Although it had early left the historical orbit of Caucasia, it nevertheless long remained ethnically and even linguistically Armenian. It was annexed A.D. 72, and in the seventh century was transformed, along with parts of Cappadocia and Pontus, into the Armeniac Theme.¹⁰ East of it, across the upper Euphrates, lay historical, that is, Great Armenia.¹¹ It was a political and social successor of Urartu,¹² emerging in 331 B.C. under the Orontid Dynasty, upon Alexander's victory over the last Achaemenid emperor.¹³ Under the succeeding Artaxiad

¹⁰ Separate from the rest of Armenia already in the Achaemenid empire (M. Ehtéham, *L'Iran sous les Achéménides* [Fribourg 1946] 170, 175), Lesser Armenia became a kingdom after its downfall. Subsequently it was part of the Pontic State and a vassal State given by Rome to various client kings, until definitively annexed A.D. 72 and made a part of Cappadocia. A separate province under Diocletian, it then became two provinces under Theodosius I, First Armenia (with Sebastea) and Second Armenia (with Melitene). In 536, Justinian I renamed them, respectively, Second and Third Armenia, altering their frontiers and enlarging them with territory from Cappadocia and Helenopontus: Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator, roi de Pont* (Paris 1890) 78-79; N. Adontz, *Armenija v époxy Justiniana* (St. Petersburg 1908) 66-90, 166-8, 173; Debevoise, *Parthia* 132-3, 141, 170, 179, 185, 199-200; D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ* (Princeton 1950) 195-6, 210, 374, 376, 389, 413, 435, 443, 475, 494, 514, 554, 557, 1237-8, 1435; M. L. Chaumont, *Recherches sur l'histoire d'Arménie* (Paris 1969) 167-71; J. B. Bury, *History of the Later Roman Empire II* (London 1923) 344-5. Under Maurice, Third Armenia was renamed First Armenia: P. Goubert, *Byzance-avant l'Islam* (Byzance et l'Orient I; Paris 1951) 296. Lastly, the Heraclians transformed Lesser Armenia and some adjacent territories into the Armeniac Theme: Charanis, *Armenians* 19-20.

¹¹ For the name, see *Studies* p. 76 n. 84. — For the general history of Armenia, see Grousset, *Histoire*; CMH IV I (1966) chap. 14 'Armenia and Georgia.'

¹² *Studies* I, especially pp. 48-80.

¹³ The First Armenian Monarchy of the Orontids (whose branches also reigned in the Kingdoms of Sophene and of Commagene), recently rescued from utter oblivion by history, is dealt with *ibid.* III, 'The Orontids of Armenia' 277-305, also 72-4.

Dynasty and especially in the reign of Tigranes II the Great (95-56 B.C.), Armenia became an imperial Power at the expense of the Seleucids and the Parthians, as well as of its other neighbors. But it came to a conflict with Rome and in 66 B.C. had to submit to Roman suzerainty.¹⁴

In the course of her struggle with Iran, Rome was twice obliged momentarily to cede to her rival the suzerain rights over Armenia, in 244¹⁵ and 363.¹⁶ However, in 387, she ceded permanently to Iran those rights over Armenia's eastern moiety;¹⁷ and the western moiety, which had remained under Roman overlordship, was annexed in part by Theodosius I in 390 and in part by Justinian I in 532.¹⁸ This western moiety of Armenia—Roman Armenia—was composed of two regions. In the north lay what had been retained by King Arsaces III in 387, when the rest—the far larger part—had fallen to his pro-Iranian cousin Chosroes IV. It was at this juncture that the two emperors, Theodosius I and Sapor III stepped in and achieved a *modus vivendi* on the basis of a self-divided apple of discord, each taking under his control the adjacent section of it.¹⁹

The Eastern Kingdom—Persarmenia of the Byzantines—which resulted from the division of 387, continued its political existence as an Iranian vassal State under its Arsacid Dynasty, until the abolition of the monarchy in 428. Thereafter, the princely States of which it was composed became immediate vassals of the Sassanid emperor.²⁰ But the Western Kingdom, vassal of Rome,

¹⁴ H. Manandian, *Tigrane II et Rome: Nouveaux éclaircissements à la lumière des sources originales*, transl. H. Thorossian (Lisbon 1963); Grousset, *Histoire* 79-104; *Studies* 74-80.

¹⁵ In the peace concluded by Philip the Arab and Sapor I, upon the defeat and death of Gordian III: Sapor I's trilingual inscription on the Kaabah of Zoroaster, ed. M. Sprengling, *Third Century Iran: Sapor and Kartir* (Oriental Institute, University of Chicago 1953) p. 7 = Plate 1, lines 3-4 (Pahlavi); 73 = Pl. 10, lines 6-10 (Greek); 15, III.1, 2 (translation); pp. 3-4, 79-85 (interpretation). Sapor's account reveals that Gordian III was killed in battle and not slain in the camp at the instigation of Philip, as the Roman gossip had it. Capitolinus, *Gordiani* (Hist. Aug.) 28.1; 29.1; 31; Ammianus 23.5.17; Zosimus 1.19; 3.32; Evagrius 5.7; Zonaras 12.18-19; cf. A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides* (Copenhagen 1944) 213-9; W. Emslin in CAH XII 88.

¹⁶ In the peace concluded by Jovian and Sapor II, upon the defeat and death of Julian: Ammianus 25.7.9-12; Zosimus 3.31; cf. Faustus of Buzanda 4.21; cf. *Studies* 150 and n. 5.

¹⁷ Cf. *infra* n. 19.

¹⁸ Cf. *infra* nn. 21, 27.

¹⁹ Faustus 6.1; Lazarus of P'arpi 6 (ed. Tiflis 1907 p. 17); *Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (ed. G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae* CSCO 132, Subsidia 4; Louvain 1952) 4-12; cf. the confused account in Procopius, *De aed.* 3.1.4-17; Ps. Moses 3.42. Both Procopius and Ps. Moses err in placing the Partition of Armenia in the reign of Theodosius II: Garitte 66-9. — For a discussion of these events and the date of the Partition, see *Studies* 151-2 and n. 6.

²⁰ Lazarus of P'arpi 13-15; Eliseus 1; Eusebius (Sebēos) (ed. Tiflis 1913) p. 34; Ps. Moses 3.63-4; *Narratio* 15-16; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 163-295; Adontz, *Armenija* 211-35; CMH IV 1.598-9.

did not outlast its only king, Arsaces III, and, after his death in 390, was annexed by the Roman Empire. However, the three princely States which were situated on its territory continued as vassal States of the Empire until annexed by Justinian in 532.²¹

South of the Western Kingdom lay what the Romans occasionally called Other Armenia,²² which passed under their control in 298 and in 377/87 and which contained six princely States ruled by five dynasties.²³ To this Pentarchy of sovereign Armenian princes, vassals of the Roman Emperor, which, together with the three princedoms of the Western Kingdom might be called Octarchy, the adherents of the political theology of East Rome applied the misnomer of 'satrapies,' as though these princes were mere, exotic (hence 'satraps'), officials of the Emperor. But the fact that the Empire, which had come to claim the position not only of New Rome, but also of New Jerusalem, officially called these vassal sovereigns 'gentiles' was a clear admission on its part of their autonomy.²⁴ Procopius has left us a description of the

²¹ The Western Kingdom, corresponding to the province of Upper Armenia, came to be called Inner Armenia by the Roman government. Together with its princely States—Acilisene (Ekejeac') of the Mamikonids, Carenitis (Karin) of the royal Arsacids, and Syspirtis (Sper) of the Bagratids—it was placed, following the annexation, under the *Comes Armeniae* (at Theodosiopolis). Sometime before August 528, Inner Armenia became the province of *Magna Armenia* (under a *praeses*). In the same year, the *comitiva Armeniae* was abolished and the office of *Magister Militum per Armeniam et Pontum Polemoniacum et gentes* instituted; in 532 the three Princes were dispossessed; and in 536 *Magna Armenia* was renamed First Armenia (under a proconsul at Justinianopolis) and enlarged with territories from Pontus and old First Armenia: *Studies* 192-6; Adontz, *Armenija* 46-65, 91-198; Bury, *Later Rom. Emp.* II 344; E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire* II (Paris/Brussels/Amsterdam 1949) 289-90. Under Maurice, First Armenia was again given the name of *Magna Armenia*: Goubert, *Byzance* 296.

²² Procopius, *De aed.* 3.1.17: τῇ δὲ ἄλλῃ Ἀρμενίᾳ...

²³ This was the territory of the former (Orontid) kingdom of Sophene (190-95 B.C.) and subsequently of the Syrian March of the Artaxiad Monarchy. The princely States situated there were Lesser Sophene (Cop'k'), Anzitene (Hanjit) and Ingilene (Angel-tun), and Greater Sophene or Sophanene (Cop'k' mec), acquired in the Treaty of Nisibis (298), as well as Asthi-anene (Hašteank') and Balabitene (Balahowit), acquired c. 377/8 or possibly in 387. The dynasty ruling in both Ingilene and Anzitene and that of Greater Sophene were Orontid branches. The Graeco-Latin names of these States have varied occasionally. Cf. *Studies* 131-5, 166-75, 303-5.

²⁴ *Satrapiae* and *gentes*/ἔθνη were the official Roman names for the Pentarchy: cf. Justinian, Nov. 31 (... τῶν ἐθνῶν ... Τζοφανηνή κτλ. ... καὶ ὑπὸ σατράπαις ...); Cod. Just. 1.29.5 (... et gentes, Anzetnam videlicet, Ingilenam etc.); Cod. Theod. 12.13.6 (Gaddamae satrapae Sophanenaes); cf. *Studies* 172. — For the political implications of ἔθνος, see R. J. H. Jenkins, ed. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus: De administrando imperio* II: Commentary (London 1962) 11. On the other hand, Armenians from the annexed region were 'Romans': cf., e.g., Procopius, *Bell. goth.* 6.27.16-17: ... καὶ τῶν Ἀρμενίων ἄνδρες ... [who fought the 'barbarians,' i.e., the Goths; and a little later, there is question of] οἱ τε ἄλλοι Ῥωμαῖοι ...

rights, privileges, and vestments of these 'Roman Satraps,' including the, to the contemporaries unbelievably great, prerogative of wearing red buskins, which only the Roman Emperor and the Great King of Iran enjoyed.²⁵ However, the Pentarchs were made to share in the fate of their northern confrères when, in 532, Justinian annexed their States.²⁶

After the Emperor Heraclius' victory over Iran in 629, nearly the whole of Free Armenia, i.e., the Eastern Kingdom which had from 387 been under Iranian suzerainty, but never annexed, passed under the aegis of the Empire, remaining free.²⁷ In 635, Heraclius introduced there the office of Presiding Prince, the nature of which will be examined later. In 653/4, the then Presiding Prince of Armenia abandoned Byzantine allegiance and accepted the overlordship of the Caliph.²⁸ Islam had just replaced Iran as the chief

²⁵ Procopius, *De aed.* 3.1.18-23; cf. *Studies* 134 and nn. 233-5.

²⁶ In 528, the princely immunity from Imperial garrisons and right to maintain armed forces were quashed through the creation of the office of *Magister militum per Armeniam et Pontum Polemoniacum et gentes* (Cod. Just. 1.29.5), under whom stood notably two *duces*, one in command of the Imperial forces at Citharizon, in Asthianene, the other at Martyropolis, in Greater Sophene. In 532, the principalities were annexed and, in 536, made to form the province of Fourth Armenia (under a *consularis*, at Martyropolis): *Studies* 174-5; Adontz, *Armenija* 28-45, 91-198; Bury, *Later Rom. Emp.* II 344. Under Maurice, this province was replaced by two: one, containing Greater Sophene and newly acquired Arzanene (Aljnik'), was called Fourth Armenia or Upper Mesopotamia (with the capital at Amida); the other, containing the rest of the Pentarchy and some territory taken from First Armenia, was called Other Fourth Armenia or *Armenia Justiniana* (with the capital at Dadima); the former passed under Arab control in the seventh century: Adontz 234; Goubert, *Byzance* 296-7, 298-301. Arzanene was the Arabian March of the Artaxiad Monarchy of Armenia; it passed under Roman control in 298, then under that of Iran in 363, reverting to Rome in 591: *Studies* 179-84; Adontz *loc. cit.*; Goubert 168-9, 297.

²⁷ Already Maurice, in the Peace of 591, pushed eastwards the frontiers of Roman Armenia, from Theodosiopolis to lake Sevan in the north and from Martyropolis to lake Van in the south: cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 251-3. The question of his reorganization of Free Armenia remains somewhat obscure; it seems that the bulk of the acquired territory (the provinces of Aysarat and Turuberan) was now called Great Armenia, while that of Tayk' was Deep Armenia and the easternmost region (near Dvin) was Lower Armenia: Goubert, *Byzance* 297-8. There was no interruption in the continued existence of the princely States situated in this territory; cf. *Studies* 147-222; Goubert 302. — For Heraclius' activity in Armenia, see Grousset 281-7.

²⁸ The first Presiding Prince for the Emperor was the Curopalate David, Prince Saharuni (135-638); his successor the Patrician Theodore, Prince Rštuni (641-c.645, 645-653/4), passed to the Caliph's allegiance and continued to rule Armenia (653/4-655): Eusebius (Sebēos) 29 (166-7), 30 (176), 32-25; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 286-7, 296-304; CMH IV 1.781 (to be corrected for the date of Theodore's accession: 641). — The treaty which Theodore concluded with the future Caliph Mu'awiya I in 653/4, and those concluded with the Caliphate by the Presiding Princes of Iberia and Albania (*Studies* 394), introduced a novel situation in the young Islamic empire: for the first time, outside Arabia, instead of conquering and annexing a part of the outside world, 'war territory,' the Caliphate, like the Iranian and

foe of the Empire in the East, and, since the Empire never gave up its claims to them, Free Armenia and Caucasia in general continued, as before, to be the battleground of empires. Muslim inroads occasionally penetrated even those Caucasian lands which had been annexed by the Empire.²⁹

It is as hazardous, though attempted as often, to treat Armenia without referring to Georgia and *vice versa*, as it is to deal with Byzantium without reference to Caucasia; the wages of this is distorted proportion. The Georgian lands³⁰ were immemorially divided into West or Pontic Georgia and East Georgia. The West Georgian Kingdom of Aea or Colchis rose possibly in the second millennium B.C. Alone in Caucasia, it was a vassal State, not a province, of the Achaemenid Monarchy; it subsequently formed part of the Pontic kingdom, was a client of Rome, and, finally, A.D. 64, was annexed as a Roman province. In the fifth century, conquered by the Lazic princes from the south, it recovered autonomy, as the Kingdom of Lazica. Though a Roman vassal, it occasionally gravitated towards Iran and thus was involved in the struggle of Justinian and Chosroes. By the seventh century, the Lazic Dynasty had disappeared and been replaced by Presiding Princes. In the 790s, West Georgia passed under the control of the Princes of Abkhazia and became the Kingdom of Abasgia which, in 1008, was united with East Georgia.

East Georgia or Iberia (K'art'li) emerged as a kingdom under the Pharnabazid Dynasty, at the beginning of the third century B.C., from the débris of the Achaemenid empire.³¹ In 65 B.C., it became a vassal of Rome, and

Roman empires, officially accepted the existence, in Caucasia, of a group of autonomous vassal States. The three Caucasian States formed then a single viceroyalty of the Caliphal empire, called *Arminiya*; and the viceroy resided first in the former Armenian capital of Dvin and, later, in the former Albanian capital of Partav (Barð'a): *Studies* 394 and n. 17. — For the earlier princely viceroys of Armenia acting on behalf of the Great King: *infra* n. 109. J. Laurent, *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam* (Paris 1919) 334, refers to Theodore Rštuni as 'général-en-chef' and not as Prince of Armenia. This must be due to his reliance on Macler's translation of Eusebius (Sebēos). In the original, Theodore is unequivocally called Prince (*iškan*) of Armenia: 30 (176), 32 (185, 188 etc.), 35 (224); CMH IV 1.781 is to be corrected accordingly.

²⁹ Laurent, *Arménie*; Grousset, *Histoire* 296-340; CMH IV 1.605-11. — The importance of Caucasia for the Empire in the Middle Byzantine phase was enhanced by the existence of its oil-wells which yielded petroleum, the chief ingredient of Greek Fire: Jenkins, *De adm. imp.* Commentary, 'General Introduction' II 7; cf. Constantine Porphyrog. *De adm. imp.* 53.492-511.

³⁰ For the general history of Georgia, see CMH IV 1 chap. 14; *Studies* 55-8, 80-5, 86-103, 253-7.

³¹ Cf. my 'Chronology of the Early Kings of Iberia,' *Traditio* 25 (1969) 1-33.

so it remained in Roman eyes, except when, in 244,³² 363,³³ and 532,³⁴ Rome officially, if momentarily, ceded to Iran the suzerain rights over it. In actual fact, however, Iberia, no less than Armenia, ceaselessly wavered between Roman and Iranian and, then, Byzantine and Islamic overlordship. In 813, it combined the allegiance to the Caliph with that to the Emperor; the one was terminated in the tenth century and the other in the eleventh.

It was in Iberia that the office of Presiding Prince was first introduced by the Empire. In 588, the Iberian Princes returned to Roman allegiance, abandoning that of Iran. Eight years previously, the Iberian Monarchy of the Chosroid Dynasty had been abolished by the Great King, exactly as the Arsacid Monarchy had been abolished in Armenia in 428, on the request of the local dynasts. But now they asked the Emperor Maurice for a king. Instead of restoring the Iberian kingship, however, the Emperor appointed one of the Princes to preside, on his behalf, over the rest, thus investing him with the combined functions of the local High Constable and of his own viceroy.³⁵ This office of Presiding Prince replaced not only the abeyant monarchy of Iberia, but also those of Armenia,³⁶ Lazica,³⁷ and Albania.³⁸ This viceregal office,

³² *Supra* n. 15. Suzerainty over Armenia almost invariably entailed that over Iberia, and also Albania: K. Trever, *Očerki po istorii i kul'ture Kavkazskoj Albanii* (Moscow/Leningrad 1959) p. 132; *Studies* 150 n. 5.

³³ *Supra* n. 16.

³⁴ The cession of Iberia is not explicitly mentioned by Procopius, *Bell. pers.* 1.22, but the clause (1.22.16) that the Iberian *émigrés* in the Empire might, if they so chose, return to Iberia is an obvious indication that that country thereafter depended on Iran and not on the Empire: *Studies* 371 n. 57; Stein, *Hist. du Bas-Empire* II 294. For the abolition of the Iberian kingship as erroneously connected with this Treaty, see *Studies* p. 272 n. 61; *Chron. of the Early Kings of Iberia* n. 127.

³⁵ *Studies* pp. 382-89. The first Presiding Prince was Guaram I, Prince of Cholatzene (Klarjet'i) and Javaxet'i, founder of the Guaramid branch of the Chosroid royal house of Iberia: Juanšer, *Hist. of King Vaxtang Gorgasal* (ed. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba* I) 217-8; *Studies* 379-82, Geneal. Table ad p. 416.

³⁶ *Supra* n. 28.

³⁷ No list of the Presiding Princes of Lazica has so far been compiled; and the scarcity of sources at our disposal leaves us with but two names: Lebarncius, *patricius Lazicae*, c. 662 (Theodosius and Theodore of Gangra, *Scholium, sive Hypomnesiticum* [PG 90] col. 195) and Σέργιος ὁ πατρίκιος τῆς Λαζικῆς, 698 (Theophanes, *Chronographia* a. 6189; Anastasius Bibliothecarius, *Hist. eccl.* [PG 108] col. 1340: *Sergius . . . patricius Lazicae*). It seems safe to assume that the title of Patrician indicates that these personages were Presiding Princes and also that the institution in question must have been introduced earlier than c. 662, i.e. about the same time as it was introduced in Armenia and Albania. Cf. *Studies* 235 n. 355. — One of the princedoms of West Georgia was Suania (Svanet'i) which played a considerable, if unwilling, role in the conflict of Justinian and Chosroes: *ibid.* 257.

³⁸ The first Presiding Prince was Varaz-Gregory I, Prince of Gardman (628-636): Moses of Kajankaytuk' (or of Dasxurēn) 2.17; 3.20; 3.3; Sumbat, *Hist. Bagr.* (ed. E. T'aqalšvili,

born of the fusion of the highest civil and military powers, was clearly the Caucasian counterpart of the Exarchate; the incumbents of both offices customarily receiving the same dignity of Patrician. There were, however, also differences between them. The Exarch governed an integral part of the Empire and was a bureaucrat sent from Constantinople. The Presiding Prince ruled a vassal, but autonomous State and was chosen from among the local dynasts, all of whom, like the Pentarchs, were the Emperor's immediate vassals; his powers therefore were of necessity more limited than those of the Exarch. On the other hand, the Presiding Prince tended to rank higher than the other. The Exarchs of Italy and of Africa were never conceded a dignity higher than that of Patrician, whereas eight out of the fourteen Princes of Iberia and six out of the twenty-one Princes of Armenia received the much higher dignity of Curopalate.³⁹

Although the endless strife of empires over Caucasia wrought havoc in it, the ninth century ushered in an era of consolidation and prosperity. In Armenia, the ruin and extinction of many princely houses left a few of them, now grown in size and importance, to partition the country between them.⁴⁰ Thus, the

K'art'lis C'xovreba [Tiflis 1906] 340; cf. *Studies* 216-17, 476-7, n. 171. See, *ibid.* 476-7 for the question of his rebaptism by Heraclius. The House of Gardman had passed after 363 from the Armenian to the Albanian political sphere: *ibid.* 216-7.

³⁹ *ibid.* 388-9; CMH IV 1.781-82. The preference thus shown by the Empire to Iberia over Armenia in this matter must have been due to the fact of Iberia's conformity to, and Armenia's dissent from, the Emperor's religion. The setting up of the Caliph's suzerainty over Caucasia placed the whole of it under the intermediate control of the caliphal viceroy of *Arminiya* (*supra* n. 28). This may be regarded as to some extent a diminution of the powers of the office of Presiding Prince, combining as it did those of an imperial viceroy and of a local High Constable. Yet, internally, this office continued to combine the highest civil and military authority in each State. In addition, the Caliph's viceroy was appointed not to each of the three States, but to the three of them together. In a sense, then, the office of Presiding Prince may be considered as having retained its viceregal character in each country even after the establishment of the Caliph's control, with the caliphal viceroy's being a sort of super-viceroy. — The importance attached by the Court of Constantinople to the Caucasian dynasts is further shown by the fact that the Kings of the Franks, Charles Martel (737-741) and Peppin the Short (751-768), were given by that Court only the title of Patrician, in 724 and 754 respectively: cf. E. Stein, 'La période byzantine de la Papauté,' *Catholic Historical Review* 21 (1935) 161-2.

⁴⁰ Laurent, *Arménie* 83-128; Grousset, *Histoire* 329-34, 341-93; *Studies* 153-4, cf. the statistics, pp. 223-9. — The growth of prosperity was in part due to the insistence of the Caliphate on collecting taxes and tribute in money which, having first ruined Armenia, nevertheless led to an economic revival as the nobility and peasantry found themselves forced to abandon the autarkic rural economy and to produce a surplus of raw and manufactured goods for sale; thus commerce and urban economy revived: A. Sorian, *Die soziale Gliederung der armenischen Völker im Mittelalter* (Leipzig 1927) 62-4; H. Manandian, *The Trade and Cities of Armenia in Relation to Ancient World Trade*, transl. N. Garsoïan (Lisbon 1965) 136-55; cf. CMH IV, 1.609.

Bagratids held the north-central and western territories;⁴¹ the Artsrunids, the south-western realm of Vaspurakan;⁴² the Siunids, the easternmost principedom of Siunia;⁴³ and the Mamikonids, until the ninth century possibly the greatest princely dynasty, though reduced now, had managed to survive in the south-west.⁴⁴ In Iberia, the most important dynasty, the Guaramids, a branch of the royal house of the Chosroids, were succeeded by a Bagratid branch.⁴⁵ In Albania, the Princes of Gardman were the leading house and, from 628, held quasi-hereditarily the office of Presiding Prince.⁴⁶ Several Caliphal officials proceeded to found dynasties in Caucasia; there were the Emirs of Tiflis, of Mantzikert (Manazkert), and of Ardzn,⁴⁷ as well as the Muslim Kurdish dynasty of the Shaddādids, ruling in parts of Albania and northeastern Armenia.⁴⁸

Of all of them, the most successful were the Bagratids. Playing off the Caliph against the Emperor, they succeeded in monopolizing in 806 the office of Presiding Prince of Armenia,⁴⁹ while in 813 their Iberian branch monopolized that of Iberia.⁵⁰ And then, profiting by the growing weakness of the Caliphate and the Byzantine offensive against its successor-states, the two Bagratid lines, Armenian and Iberian, restored in their own favor the two chief Caucasian monarchies, that of Armenia, dormant from 428, in 884⁵¹

⁴¹ *Studies* 201-3, 306-54. The principalities held by the Bagratids at this period were, Aršarunk' and Siracene (Širak) (acquired from the Kamsarakans) and southern Tayk' Bagravandene (Bagrewand), and Taraun (wrested from the Mamikonids).

⁴² *Studies* 199-200.

⁴³ *Studies* 214.

⁴⁴ *Studies* 209-12. The Mamikonids finally retained only southwestern Taraun (with Arsamosata) and Sasun.

⁴⁵ *Studies* 253-4, 389-416. The Guaramids nearly monopolized the office of Presiding Prince of Iberia: *ibid.* Geneal. Table ad p. 416; CMH IV 1.781-2; cf. *supra* n. 35.

⁴⁶ *Supra* n. 38.

⁴⁷ V. Minorsky, s.v. 'TMMs,' *Encyclop. of Islam* 4; J. Markwart, *Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen* (Vienna 1930) 501-8; Jenkins, *De adm. imp.* Commentary (note 24 *supra*) II 167, 169; Laurent, *Arménie* 320-1, 322-6, 326-8.

⁴⁸ Appearing in the tenth century: Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian History* (London 1953).

⁴⁹ By Ašot IV, Prince of the Bagratids (for the genitive plural of the *nomen gentilicium*, as part of the Armenian princely nomenclature, see *Studies* p. 130): Asołik 2.2; Samuel of Ani (available to me only in the Latin tr. of J. Zohrab and A. Mai, PG 19) 706; cf. Markwart (Marquart), *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig 1903) 451-2; Laurent, *Arménie* 98-104; Grousset, *Histoire* 341-3; CMH IV 1.609-10. The significance of the restoration of the Principate, after its temporary suppression by the Caliphate, in favor of Ašot IV seems to have escaped the notice of the primary sources.

⁵⁰ By Ašot I the Great, Duke of Cholarzene: *Chronicle of Iberia* (ed. Qauxč'išvili, *K'art'lis C'xovreba* I) 252; Vardan (ed. Venice 1862) 77; cf. Toumanoff, 'The Bagratids of Iberia from the Eighth to the Eleventh Century,' *Le Muséon* 74 (1961) 11-12; *Studies* 353 and n. 54, p. 415; CMH IV 1.610.

⁵¹ By Ašot V, Prince of the Bagratids, thereafter Ašot I the Great, with the Caliph's

and that of Iberia, dormant from 580, in 888.⁵² Especially fruitful was the revival of the Armenian Monarchy, for it ushered in the Bagratid renaissance of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, during which a pan-Bagratid condominium contained the several Armenian and Iberian princedoms under the paramountcy of the King of Armenia, residing from the mid-tenth century, in the great city of Ani. This was a brilliant moment of history, with Armenia again a great Power and the whole of Caucasia involved in the new cultural and economic flowering.⁵³ And not the least of the causes for this renaissance

authorization King of Armenia: John Katholikos (ed. Tiflis 1912) 139-40; Thomas Arcruni 3.20 (ed. Tiflis 1917, pp. 368, 369); Asoĭk 3.2; Samuel of Ani 709-10; Cyriacus (Karakos) of Ganja (ed. Tiflis 1909) 74; Vardan 85-6; Stephen Orbelian 37; cf. Laurent, *Arménie* 284-95; Grousset, *Histoire* 394-7; CMH IV 1.612-13. The exact date of the coronation of Ašot appears to have been Wednesday, 26 August 884, on the basis of a colophon found in a MS of the Gospels, copied, together with the colophon, from an earlier MS in the fourteenth century (Matenadaran № 3711): V. Hakobyan, *Mayr žamanakagrut'yunner (XIII-XVIII dd.)* II (Erevan 1956) note 45, pp. 156-7; cf. 156-62 = 'La date de l'avènement d'Ašot, premier roi Bagratide,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 2 (1965) 273-82. There is, however, a certain difficulty in connection with this colophon. It states that the Katholikos 'anointed Ašot as King of Armenia' ('ceac' zAšot t'agawor Hayoc'): *Mayr žamanakagr.* p. 157 (fol. 159b). And yet the Katholikos John, a contemporary, asserts categorically that his predecessor 'instead of anointing with the holy chrism, crowned him King' (p'ixanak ōcman sruaki iwloyn psaken zna t'agawor): John Kath. 139. Whatever the reason for the omission of anointing (cf. *Revue des ét. arm.* 2.274), the fact of the contradiction remains. The later sources, oblivious of the omission, indeed speak of the anointing of Ašot; and so does our colophon. It has, after all, reached us in a fourteenth-century MS, and we have no guarantee of its really being written by a contemporary. The name of its author, Grigor Maškewor, is not known in Armenian history, except (and this is perhaps significant) that Matthew of Edessa (3.217) records the death of the illustrious Armenian *vardapet* Grigor surnamed Maškewor, which occurred A. Arm. 563 = A.D. 1114/1115. — Previous to his elevation to the royal status, Ašot had been Presiding Prince of Armenia for the Caliph, from 856: John Kath. 132-3; Asoĭk 2.2.; Cyriacus 74; cf. Laurent 213; Grousset 372. About 862, he became Prince of Princes of Armenia: John Kath. 120; Thomas 3.20 (pp. 357, 365); Cyriacus 74; Vardan 82; Samuel of Ani 709-10; cf. Laurent 267-8; Grousset 372-3. The latter title, rendered as ἀρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων, the Court of Constantinople continued to apply to the Bagratid sovereigns of Armenia even after the coronation of Ašot: Constantine Porphy., *De adm. imp.* 43.30, 34, 112; 44 *passim*.

⁵² By Adarnase IV: Sumbat, *Hist. Bagr.* 347; cf. Toumanoff, *Bagr. of Iberia* 21-5; CMH IV 1.613. — For the abolition of the Iberian Monarchy in 580: Juanšer 217; cf. *Studies* 360-82; CMH IV 1.602.

⁵³ The King of Armenia was the recognized overlord of the other Armenian dynasts and could command a considerable number of troops. Matthew of Edessa gives the number of the regular troops under King Ašot III (952-977) as 45,000 and that of the levy in mass as 100,000 (1.5, 6); and the number of troops summoned by John-Smbat III (1020-1041), when the kingdom had been greatly reduced in size, as 40,000 foot and 20,000 horse (1.9); cf. also 1.14. Though possibly exaggerated, these figures are not wholly out of the historical context: suffice it to recall that the Armenian military aid to the Caliph after 653/4 was

was the fact that Byzantium seemed to accept the solution of protectorate rather than that of annexation.⁵⁴

However, practically from the beginning of the Bagratid renaissance, two factors were working against it. One was internal division; the other, renewed Byzantine annexationism. The great princely States of which Armenia was composed, had never accepted their overlord the King as anything more than a glorified Presiding Prince;⁵⁵ and they tended to grow even more independent with time. In 908, the Artsrunids, with Saracen prompting, set up a separate kingdom in their domain of Vaspurakan.⁵⁶ In the 970s, the Princes of Siunia followed suit.⁵⁷ To make matters worse, the great princely dynasties,

15,000 horse: Eusebius (Sebēos) 35 (p. 224); Leontius (Lewond) 25 (ed. St. Petersburg 1887, p. 120); or that the levy in mass of the Theme of Iberia (comprising the reduced Kingdom of Armenia and the inheritance of the Curopalate David II of Tao, i.e., the greater part of the northern half of Armenia) amounted to 50,000 men: Cedrenus 2.608; cf. also the statistics of the Armenian military potential in *Studies* 236-9. — The fertile soil of Caucasia was carefully irrigated and cultivated; its industries and commerce flourished participating in two great economic systems, the Caspian of the Muslims and the Pontic of the Byzantines. Old cities revived, new ones, like Ani, arose. Architecture, Caucasia's chief art, entered a new phase of flowering, as Caucasian dynasts vied with one another in building monasteries and castles and beautifying their cities with churches and palaces. Armenian and Georgian historical literature reached a high point during this period: S. Der Nersessian, 'Armenia in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries,' *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies* (London 1967) 427-31; Grousset, *Histoire* 394-541; CMH IV 1.612-17. — For the economic aspect of this revival, see also *supra* n. 40. Cf. also V. Haroutiounian, 'L'urbanisme en Arménie du Moyen Âge,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 5 (1968) 51-63.

⁵⁴ Armenian historians, John Katholikos (p. 140), Cyriacus of Ganja (p. 75), and Vardan (pp. 85-6), supply us with details regarding this *rapprochement* between Basil I and Ašot I. The Emperor's Armenian origin may well have had something to do with this, but more so, doubtless, his political wisdom in fostering a friendly buffer State between Byzantium and Islam. The alliance of Armenia and the Empire following King Ašot II's visit to Constantinople in 914 was a continuation of this policy, as also, to some extent, was the alliance of King Ašot III and the Emperor John I Tzimiskes in 974. See for all this Grousset, *Histoire* 395-6, 443-6, 494-500. — The date of Ašot II's visit, as given in CMH IV 1.614, is to be corrected (on the basis of Theophanes Contin. 386; Symeon Magister 722-3; George Monach. [Contin.] 879-80; Leo the Grammarian 491; Cedr. 2.284) to 914; cf. Adontz, 'Ašot Erkat' ou de Fer, roi d'Arménie de 913 à 929,' reprinted in *Études arméno-byzantines* (Lisbon 1965) 265-83.

⁵⁵ Laurent, *Arménie* 287-8.

⁵⁶ Thomas Arçruni 3.22; John Katholikos 171-2; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 433-5. What began as the setting up of Xaç'ik-Gagik, Prince Arçruni as an anti-King of Armenia, soon became, since the Bagratid position remained unaffected by this, a permanent division of Armenia into two separate kingdoms, of Armenia and of Vaspurakan. Cf. also CMH IV 1.784.

⁵⁷ Stephen Orbelian 55 (ed. Tiflis 1910, pp. 299-301); 59 (317); cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 484-5. The exact date of the assumption of the royal title (with the consent of the neighbouring Islamic Courts) by Smbat II of Siunia is not known; recent research places this event in the 970s: H. Berberian's important review and résumé of H. M. Utmazyan's Armenian work on Siunia

and the Bagratid-royal house itself, began to subdivide.⁵⁸ Younger Bagratid branches twice founded kingdoms of their own, at Kars on 961 and at Lori in 982, in addition to holding the separate principalities of Taraun, Syspirtis, and Moxoene.⁵⁹ In the circumstances the Kingdom of Armenia had become

(Siwnik') in the ninth and tenth centuries (not available to me), in *Revue des études arméniennes* 3 (1966) 408. Cf. also CMH IV 1.784.

⁵⁸ The tendency of dividing States between several sons or several branches begins to be very much in evidence in Caucasian society in the ninth century. The fundamental Caucasian system of succession was one of primogeniture occasionally modified by the by-norm of a limited lateral succession, and it admitted of no division. At the same time, the ownership of a family demesne was communal, the head of the family being merely the administrator of it: *Studies* 119-23. One may, therefore, venture the suggestion that the innovation in question was due to the fact that the few remaining princely houses of Armenia ruled States that were composed of several older princedoms. The unity of such a composite State was, accordingly, somewhat artificial and, at any rate, recent; it thus could, and did, break up into component parts that were possessed of a greater self-sufficiency and ethnopolitical unity, i.e., precisely, the older, historical, principalities which had been made to form it. This fragmentation must have been aided by the change then taking place in the tenurial rights of the cadets of the princely houses, the *sepuhk'*. Originally, as has been said, they shared in the communal possession of the dynastic demesne; but after the fall of the Arsacid Monarchy of Armenia there developed the tendency of giving separate appanages to them, and, by the ninth century, they had been known to transfer on occasion their allegiance to another reigning prince, not the head of their dynasty, which must signify that this system tended to acquire a political character, that appanages were being transformed into sub-States: cf. *Studies* 124. In connection with all this must be the fact that, by the tenth century, the by-norm of lateral succession had superseded in Armenia the earlier norm of primogeniture: *ibid.* 120-2 n. 207.

⁵⁹ Mušel, younger brother of Ašot III, King of Armenia, became King of Kars (with the land of Vanand) in 962, and in 982, Gurgēn, younger brother of King Smbat II, became King of Lori and 'of Albania' (with the land of Tašir-Joraget: roughly ancient Gogarene/Gugark'): Asojik 3.8; Vardan p. 90; Mxit'ar of Ayrivank' (ed. Moscow 1860) 56; cf. Matthew of Edessa 1.10; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 483, 507-8; L. Movsėsean, 'Lori et l'histoire de la famille bagratide arménienne Kurikian' (tr. F. Macler), *Revue des études arméniennes* 7 (1927) 209-66. — The branch of Taraun stemmed from Bagarat II, son of Ašot IV, Prince of the Bagratids, in 826, and was dispossessed through Byzantine annexation in 966/7: Thomas Arcruni 2.5-7; John Katholikos 117; Asojik 2.2; 3.8; Cedrenus 2.375 (for the date of the annexation: *infra* n. 66); cf. Grousset 349, 493-4; Adontz, 'Les Taronites en Arménie et à Byzance,' reprinted in *Études arméno-byzantines* 197-263; Laurent, *Arménie* 105; Markwart (Marquart), *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge* (Leipzig 1903) 463-4; *Südarmenien* 296-8, 495-500. — The ancient Bagratid principality of Syspirtis (*Studies* pp. 202, 321 and n. 76) was annexed by Justinian in 532 (*supra* n. 21), regained by the Bagratids, during the Byzantino-Muslim struggles, sometime before 772 (*Studies* 323-4 n. 81), and recognized as theirs by the Empire in 835: Asojik 2.6; cf. Markwart, *Streifzüge* 421. The line of Syspirtis, thus founded by Ašot, son of Šapuh and nephew of Ašot IV, did not last for more than a century: *ibid.* 439. Nor did the line of Moxoene (Mokk'), which princedom had originally been under its own dynasty (*Studies* p. 182) then was acquired by Smbat VIII, Prince of the Bagratids, whose son Mušel was the founder of the line: Thomas Arcruni 3.2, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20; cf. Markwart,

reduced to merely a part of the Bagratid princely State and to some recent acquisitions of the Kings, like Ashot II. The growing independence of the princely States and their inner division worked in fact simultaneously. In Iberia, the Bagratids were also divided into several independent lines and struggled for hegemony in the Georgian lands with the Kings of Abasgia.⁶⁰ Kakhetia, Iberia's easternmost province had from the beginning of the ninth century been an independent principality.⁶¹ Albania, lastly, had long been divided into cis-Cyran and trans-Cyran Albania. The former, ruled at first by Presiding Princes, was greatly reduced in the tenth century and, in the eleventh, united with Siunia as a kingdom.⁶² The latter momentarily revived, after Khazar devastations as a kingdom, in the ninth and tenth centuries.⁶³

Parallel to this fissiparous process, and alongside the policy of protection, came Byzantine aggression. In the 870s already, Basil I, who was soon to inaugurate the friendly collaboration with Armenia, interfered rather inimically in Armenian affairs.⁶⁴ Then, actual annexations took place: that of

Strel'zige 464-5; *Südarmenien* 495-500. Cf. also (for both Syspiritis and Moxoene) Laurent, *Arménie* 109, 114-5, 127; *Studies* 202, 200. — Worse still, the diminished Kingdom of Armenia was divided, c. 1021-1040, between John-Smbat III and his younger brother Ašot IV: Aristaces (Aristakēs) of Lastivert 10 (ed. Tiflis 1912, p. 51); Matthew of Edessa 1.8-9; Vardan 92-3; cf. Grousset 542-4.

⁶⁰ Toumanoff, *Bagr. of Iberia*; *Studies* 485-98. There were the Dukes of Tao (= Arm. Tayk'), later of Upper and of Lower Tao, the Dukes of Cholarzene (Klarjet'i), with the city of Artanuji, and the Princes, later Kings, and Curopalates of Iberia. — For the rivalry with the Kings of Abasgia, see A. Gugushvili, 'The Chronological and Genealogical Table of the Kings of Georgia,' *Georgica* 1.2-3 (1936) 120-2; Toumanoff, 'Chronology of the Kings of Abasgia and Other Problems,' *Le Muséon* 69 (1956) 75-6.

⁶¹ Gugushvili, *Chron.-Geneal. Table* 136-7. The chronology given in Gugushvili is subject to modification. The first independent Prince of Kakhetia, Gregory, makes his appearance after Ašot the Great's receiving the dignity of Curopalate: *Chron. Iber.* 252-3; Ašot was made a Curopalate in 813: *supra* n. 50.

⁶² Moses Kajankat. 3.23; Stephen Orbellian 59 (318-21); cf. *Studies* 216, 257-8; Grousset, *Histoire* 616-7.

⁶³ Moses Kajankat. 3.22; John Katholikos 170-1; Asojik 3.3; Stephen Orbellian 52 (218), 55 (219); Ma'sūdī, as quoted by Laurent, *Arménie* 211 n. 1. It was Hamam, probably of the ancient Albanian royal dynasty of Apanšahik, who c. 893 restored the dormant Albanian kingship in his principedom of Šak'ē (Šakkī) and Heret'i; cf. also *Studies* 258 and n. 362; Laurent *loc. cit.*; Grousset, *Histoire* 403; V. Minorsky, 'Caucasica IV,' *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15/3 (1953) 504-14.

⁶⁴ The weakening division of Caucasia and the consequent partial loss of its value as a buffer State in the eyes of Byzantium may indeed be urged as an excuse for the Basilid abandonment of the policy of protectorate for that of annexation. Yet it will also be noted that this change of policy, while it indeed played a decisive role in the destruction of the Bagratid renaissance in Armenia, had in actual fact begun manifesting itself before the setting in of the process of division in Caucasia. For a time, the two policies worked parallelly. Then the successes in the war on Islam must have whetted the Byzantine appetite for the

the principality of Digisene on the threshold of the tenth century⁶⁵ and that of Taraun in 966/7.⁶⁶ It was left to the cosmocrat that was Basil II to bring this tendency to a near triumph.

In 1000, the Emperor obtained the Duchy of Upper Tao (Tayk'), an important part of the dynastic domains of the Iberian Bagratids. It had been bequeathed to him by the last Duke, the Curopalate David II, apprehensive of Basil II's possible reprisal for having aided Bardas Phocas in his revolt of 987-989. Upper Tao and neighboring territory were thus made the Byzantine Theme of Iberia. This acquisition was followed by two wars, in 1021 and 1022, between the Empire and the Kingdom of Georgia, which had been formed in 1008 through the union of Abasgia and Iberia and which now disputed the Emperor's right to Tao, as part of the Bagratid 'Hereditary Lands.' In both wars Georgia was beaten and weakened.⁶⁷

preferred policy of annexationism. At the Council of Širakawan in 862 (cf. *Rev. des ét. armén.* 2.279), the national Armenian Church rejected Photius' advances, which had been made in reply to Ašot V, Prince of Armenia's (*supra* n. 51) request for Imperial support: Laurent, *Arménie* 187-8, 217-20; Grousset, *Histoire* pp. 382-4. Thereafter, Basil I, in the 870s, interfered inimically in Armenian affairs. Imperial control was imposed on the Prince of Taraun, Ašot V's homonymous cousin, who was created a Curopalate and set up as an anti-Prince of Armenia in opposition, obviously, to Ašot V and to the work of consolidation that was then being carried on, albeit under official Caliphal auspices, by him. This is clear from Thomas Arcruni 3.19; cf. CMH IV 1.612; Laurent 271-5 (Laurent seems to imply, 272-3 n. 10, 274, erroneously, that Ašot of Taraun's brother David succeeded him as Prince of Armenia, whereas the question is merely of his succession to Taraun).

⁶⁵ Digisene (Dēgik' = Τεκής) represented, as a principedom, a revival of the tradition of the Pentarchs, which had been made possible under, it appears, a Mamikonid branch, by the struggle of Byzantium and Islam. After its annexation by Leo VI, it formed, together with other portions of Roman Armenia that had been recovered from Islamic control, the Theme of Mesopotamia: Constantine Porphy. *De adm. imp.* 50.115, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123; *De them.* 9; cf. E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches* (Brussels 1935) 69, 76-7; Adontz, *Taronites* (n. 50 *supra*) 299; Charanis, *Armenians* 29; Jenkins, *De adm. imp.* Commentary II 189.

⁶⁶ Grousset, *Histoire* 493-4; Adontz, *Taronites* 231-2; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 483-4, 495; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 148-9; Charanis, *Armenians* 31. — Asojik 3.8, dates the death of the last Prince of Taraun, the Byzantine annexation of the principality, and a solar eclipse as in 415 Arm. Era = 30 Mar. 966—30 Mar. 967. Unfortunately for any attempt to arrive at a more precise date, there were an eclipse on 20 June 966 and another one on 13 Jan. 967: V. Grumel, *La Chronologie* (Traité d'études byzantines 1; Paris 1958) 464. On the other hand, Cedrenus 2.375, places both the 'cession' of Taraun and the eclipse in 968. It seems unquestionable that (*pace* Adontz) the information of Asojik must, in this case, be given preference.

⁶⁷ Sumbat, *Hist. Bagr.* 352, 354-9; *Chron. Iber.* 284-9; Asojik 3.43, 44; Aristaces 1, 2, 3, 4; Cedrenus 2.431, 447; Vardan 95; Zonaras 17.9; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 529-35, 538-9, 547-50; CMH IV 1.617-21; Z. Avalichvili, 'La succession du curopalate David d'Ibérie, dynaste de Tao,' *Byzantion* 8 (1933) 177-202; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 150-67. Part of the Curopalate's do-

Basil II's next acquisition was the Artsrunid kingdom of Vaspurakan. Hard pressed by Muslim inroads, beginning in 1016,⁶⁸ King Sennacherib-John offered to abdicate in favor of the Emperor. Instead of giving aid, Basil annexed Vaspurakan, in the winter of 1021-1022, which became the Catepanate of Baspracania, while the ex-King was given dignities and lands in Cappadocia.⁶⁹

Lastiy came the turn of the Bagratid kingdom of Armenia, where King John-Smbat III repeated the error of David of Tao. Fearing Basil's ire for the aid he had given to the King of Georgia, he offered to name the Emperor his heir. When John-Smbat III died in 1041, Basil II was no more, and it was Michael IV who, arms in hand, claimed the inheritance. However, with the support of loyal vassals,⁷⁰ the late King's nephew Gagik II ascended the throne and then proceeded to resist both the direct Byzantine attack and those, instigated by the Imperial government, on the part of the King of Lori and the Shaddādid emir.⁷¹ Nevertheless, with the aid of traitors at Court, the young

main was a territory in northwestern Armenia granted to him personally by the Empire, in recompense for the aid (12,000 horse) which had made possible the imperial victory over Bardas Sclerus in 979.—For the date of the Curopalate's death (31 March 1000): *Bagr. of Iberia* 39-40.

⁶⁸ Before the first Seljuq attacks on Armenia occurring in the 1030s (*infra* n. 77), it was twice invaded by various Turco-Mongolic tribes which had been settled in Azerbaijan from the beginning of the eleventh century. In 1016 they attacked Vaspurakan causing its king's decision to abdicate in favor of the Emperor, and in 1021 they struck at the Pahlavid principality of Nig, doubtless precipitating thereby the cession of Vaspurakan to the Empire. This is made clear by S. Agadžanov and K. Yuzbašyan, 'K istorii tjurkskix nabegov na Armeniju v. XI v.,' *Palestinskij Sbornik* 13 (1965) 144-57. The Pahlavids (for whom see *Studies* 206-7), in the person of the Magister Gregory II, later *Dux* of Mesopotamia, ceded c. 1045/6 Nig, with the castle of Bjni, to the Empire: Aristaces 10 (p. 61); Vardan 99; cf. Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 175.

⁶⁹ Aristaces 3 (p. 20); Yahya (ed. Rosen, St. Petersburg 1883) 59; Cedrenus 2.464; Thomas Arcruni Contin. 3.41; Samuel of Ani 723-4; Vardan 92; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 551-6; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 168-73; CMH IV 1.619.—Already in 1001, Basil II and Sennacherib-John concluded an alliance (Matthew of Edessa 1.32), which can only have implied Imperial protectorate over Vaspurakan, cf. Asojik 3.43, 46.

⁷⁰ Especially of the Pahlavid family, led by Prince Vahram II Pahlawuni, High Constable of Armenia (†1045/6), uncle of the Magister Gregory (*supra* n. 68): Aristaces 10 (p. 54); Matthew of Edessa 1.59, 60.

⁷¹ Matthew of Edessa 1.61 makes clear the *entente* between the Courts of Constantinople and of Lori, but, reversing quite improbably the causality, attributes the attack of Michael IV to the instigation of David I Lackland, King of Lori (989-1046/8), who himself struck at Armenia upon Gagik II's accession. The Emperor Michael, who invoked the testament of John-Smbat III can hardly have needed any prompting; and Constantinople's instigation in 1045 of the Šaddādid Abul-Answār I to attack Armenia (Cedrenes 2.558; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 574-5; Minorsky, *Studies in Cauc. Hist.* 52-3; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 174-5; F. Dölger, *Regesten* I 2 p. 6) plainly shows the correct pattern of the *entente*, which Matthew

King was lured to Constantinople in 1045 and there bullied into abdication, receiving, in turn, Byzantine dignities and lands in Cappadocia, as well as a palace in the Imperial capital. His kingdom was annexed and made a part of the Theme of Iberia. It was Constantine IX who had completed the work of Basil II.⁷²

Thereafter Armenian princes and nobles began an exodus to Cappadocia in the wake of the exiled kings, or to North Syria, Cilicia, and Georgia.⁷³ Then, manifesting a stupidity that was as great as the crime of annexation, the government of Constantine IX abolished the ancient levy in mass obligations in the Theme of Iberia, replacing them with a heavy taxation.⁷⁴ The annexed Armenian territories were thus not only left leaderless, but also largely deprived of national defence.

A few States, however, still remained in Armenia, notably, the Kingdoms of Kars, Lori, and Siunia, the Mamikonid principality of Sasun and the Artsrunid principality of Moxoene.⁷⁵ But no more than Georgia, recently weakened by the Byzantine wars, could they serve as buffers to protect the Empire against the mounting Turkish tide. What is more, the road leading to Byzantium passed, precisely, through the annexed kingdoms of Vaspurakan and Armenia and through the annexed principality of Taraun. And it was at this

misunderstood. This cooperation of Lori with Byzantium may explain why David I's successor, Gurgēn/Korikē/Kiwrikē II (co-King from c. 1046) appears to have received the dignity of Curopalate, and may thus justify D. M. Lang's inference that the coins (of a single known type) struck by a Curopalate Korikē (with Armenian legends) must belong to the latter sovereign: 'Supplementary Notes on Kiurike II, King of Lori in Armenia and His Coins, *Museum Notes* (The American Numismatic Society) 6 (1954) 183-91; but cf. *ibid.* 10 (1962) 107-12.

⁷² Aristaces 10 (pp. 60-2); Cedrenus 2.556-9; Matthew of Edessa 1.56-61, 66; Samuel of Ani 725-6; Vardan 97-100; Cyriacus 85-6; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 556-8, 568-72, 574-81; Honigsmann, *Ostgrenze* 174-5; CMH IV 1.619-20. It may be noted in passing that Gagik was ready to recognize the Emperor's overlordship, but that the latter was bent on annexation pure and simple: Cedrenus 2.557. This was a salient example of the triumph of an irrational political theology — cosmocratism — over rational politics.

⁷³ Aristaces 10 (p. 58); cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 586-7; Charanis, *Armenians* 50-53. The fact that about one-fifth of the Georgian royal and princely dynasties, forming about one-third of the houses into which these were divided, were of Armenian origin (*Studies* 266-73, 254) is due to the immigration of numerous members of the Armenian princely class, especially after the fall of the Armenian kingdoms in the eleventh century. A wave of the Armenian *émigrés* to the Empire flooded its Hellenic territories with a religiously, ethnically, and linguistically distinct element, which in the circumstances was moreover a hostile element (Charanis 51-7) — one of the negative effects of the annexation.

⁷⁴ Cedrenus 2.608; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 586-7; Honigsmann, *Ostgrenze* p. 178.

⁷⁵ Adontz, *Taronites* 235-41; Markwart, *Südarmenien* 517-30; Grousset, *Histoire* 607-8, 331 n. 2; *Studies* 210 (for the Mamikonids of Sasun and Arsamosata); — Markwart 528; *Studies* 182, 200 (for the Arerunids of Moxoene).

time that Muslim aggression, spearheaded by the Seljuq Turks, began making itself felt forcefully. From 1037/8, Armenian, Anatolian, and Georgian territories were subjected to almost yearly Turkish attacks. Then, on 16 August 1064, Ani fell to the invaders. Immediately thereafter, the King of Kars ceded his State to the Emperor, in exchange for the customary compensations, but the Turks snatched it from the Byzantines.⁷⁶ Finally in 1071, in the battle of Mantzikert, the Emperor Romanus IV was defeated and captured by the Seljuqid Alp Arslān; thereafter all the Caucasian acquisitions of the Basilids were lost to the Seljuqids. The road to the heart of the Empire was now open, and soon in Anatolia a Muslim 'Roman Empire' was set up by the younger Seljuqids, Syria was divided between the Seljuqids and the Crusaders, and in Cilicia the bulk of the Armenian *émigrés* founded a kingdom in exile, while the surviving Caucasian States had to accept Seljuqid suzerainty.⁷⁷

* * *

There are two aspects under which Byzantino-Caucasian, and in particular Byzantino-Armenian, relations can be viewed. They can be viewed as relations between Byzantium and Caucasias and also as those between Byzantium and the Caucasians. From the Byzantine point of view this is a matter of foreign or of domestic policy. So far we have examined the first kind of relations; we may now pass to examining the second kind. In both, Armenia and the Armenians played a far greater role than Georgia and the Georgians. Armenia lay closer to the Empire and, before the eleventh century, its historical importance outshone that of Georgia.

The role in question was threefold. In the first place, quite passively, it consisted in the fact, of which the foregoing is a sufficient illustration, that Armenia, and generally Caucasias, constituted a permanent and highly important factor in the foreign policy of the Empire, one of the chief reasons for its conflicts with Iran and Islam.⁷⁸ This aspect of the role was, consequently, mainly connected with the first kind of relations, i.e., those between Byzantium and Caucasias.

⁷⁶ Cedrenus 2.606; Samuel of Ani 729; Vardan 102-4; Cyriacus pp. 86-7; Matthew of Edessa 2.288; *Chron. Iber.* p. 307; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 615-6; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* 188; CMH IV 1.620.

⁷⁷ Grousset, *Histoire* 585-636; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze* pp. 177-90; CMH IV 1.620 — Seljuq invasions of Armenia took place in 1037/8, 1043/4 1045/6, 1049, 1054/5, 1055/6, 1056/7, 1057/8, 1059, 1062/3, 1064, 1065/6, 1067, 1069/70, see also Agadžanov and Yuzbašyan, *K istorii tjurkskix nabegov* (note 68 *supra*).

⁷⁸ To this importance, the liberal bestowal of Byzantine titles upon Caucasian dynasts, and in particular of the dignity of Curopalate, bears an eloquent witness.

Then, actively, this time, this role consisted in the Caucasian, and especially Armenian, contributions to the Empire, and therefore was connected with the second kind of relations, i.e., those between Byzantium and the Caucasians. This active role falls under two headings: (1) Manpower and Leadership and (2) Imprint.

The relations between Byzantium and the Caucasians, which we are about to examine now, began before the ushering in of the phase of history which scholars have agreed to call Middle Byzantine; and they ended before the end of this phase. The chief reason for their inception was military and was connected with the problem of recruitment. After the end of the sixth century, when the Balkan Peninsula had been devastated and barbarized and thus largely lost to the Empire as its principal recruiting ground, it was Caucasia that succeeded to this role.⁷⁹ This, naturally, concerned more those regions of Caucasia which had at different times been annexed by the Empire than the regions which had remained free.⁸⁰ Now both the Caucasian contribution under the aspect of manpower and that under the aspect of leadership were connected with recruitment.

Accordingly, before the end of the sixth century, the Armenians were merely one of the several ethnic groups in the Imperial armed forces. Thereafter, they became possibly the most prominent group. And in the ninth and tenth centuries, at the height of the Middle Byzantine phase, they formed something like twenty-five percent of the armed forces of the Empire, if not indeed more.⁸¹

Another contribution to manpower, and one not necessarily connected with military service, was a continuous stream of migration, chiefly from Free Armenia, which was moving into the integral parts of the Empire. This mass penetration was due either to forcible transplantation or to voluntary immi-

⁷⁹ Charanis, *Armenians* 16-8.

⁸⁰ We know, for instance, that the Pentarchs, who may have been under the obligation of rendering military aid to their suzerain the Emperor (Adontz, *Armenija* 105, 109), maintained their own regular armies: Procopius, *De aed.* 3.1.24-25, 27. Accordingly, only a fraction of the available men, and very likely not a considerable one, constituted, if at all, the military aid of vassal States. It was, as a matter of fact, in the name of a more efficient defence against Iran that Justinian effected his annexation of the Pentarchy: Procopius 3.1.27-8. — The most important annexed lands were thus the two parts of Roman Armenia, which have already been examined: the Western Kingdom and the Pentarchy. These, together with Lesser Armenia, could within a century or so after Justinian, compensate the Empire for the loss of the Balkan peninsula as a recruiting ground. And this is the reason why, while before the end of the sixth century the Armenians were merely one of the several ethnic groups of which the Imperial armies were composed, they became thereafter the preponderant group: *infra* at n. 81.

⁸¹ Charanis, *Armenians* 16-21, 32-4.

gration. The practice of transplanting groups of Armenians from both annexed and free lands was inaugurated in the age of Justinian, and was continued to the end of the Basilid age. In this way, large Armenian settlements were established throughout the Empire, in Macedonia, Greece, South Italy, Sicily, Crete, Cyprus, western Anatolia, and, above all, Thrace.⁸² This practice was indeed connected with recruitment, and the settling of Armenians in Thrace was intended as a protection of the Imperial capital from pressures in the Danube area.⁸³

Voluntary migration was mainly caused by the troubled conditions at home, as Free Armenia was made a perpetual battlefield of empires; as it was subjected to occasional Iranian and systematic Saracen, especially Abbasid oppression; and, lastly, as it lay open to the Turkish invasions of the eleventh century. This migration followed two principal directions. One wave of it was moving, from long before the Middle Byzantine phase, into Lesser Armenia, strengthening the local Armenian element there, and the neighboring Cappadocian and Pontic territories; and it was precisely this swelling of the Armenian population in these regions that earned its name for the Armeniac Theme. The other wave was moving, especially after the mid-tenth century, into North Syria and Cilicia.⁸⁴ It was not overpopulation at home that prompted these waves of emigration, but, to repeat, unsettled conditions, as well as the attractions and opportunities offered by the capital and the Empire; it thus proved a heavy drain on Armenia's resources of leadership and manpower.⁸⁵ This influx not only largely made up for the loss of the Roman Armenian territories to Islam after the seventh century, but also continued parallelly with the recovery of these territories in the ninth-tenth, and the annexations of new ones in the eleventh, century.⁸⁶

So much for manpower; now leadership. In Roman and Byzantine society military leadership could lead to political and social leadership as well, and even to the Imperial throne. This, in turn, could also lead to cultural leadership. The Caucasians from both annexed and Free Caucasian lands came to exercise military leadership in the Empire already in the Late Roman phase.⁸⁷

⁸² *Ibid.* 14-16; *idem*, *Ethnic Changes* 29-31.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 15.

⁸⁴ Adontz, *Armenija* 202-6; Charanis, *Armenians* 13-14, 19-21, 29, 32, 51; Grousset, *Histoire* 522. This was doubtless the reason why the provinces of Lesser Armenia were being augmented by additions of Cappadocian and Pontic territory: *supra* at n. 10. Cf. G. de Jerphanion, *Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce* (Paris 1942) 399.

⁸⁵ Adontz, *Armenija* 205.

⁸⁶ Charanis, *Armenians* 28-32. This influx of the Armenians, when not actually enforced, was encouraged by the Imperial government: Adontz, *Armenija* 204.

⁸⁷ Military leadership was exercised in the Empire not only by the inhabitants of the annexed Caucasian provinces, in particular by the local aristocracy drawn to the Imperial Court,

One of the first Caucasian generals in the Roman service was the prince Bacurius, *comes domesticorum* and *Palaestini limitis dux* under Theodosius I.⁸⁸ He supplied Rufinus with an account of the Conversion of Iberia,⁸⁹ which he was well qualified to do, being Vitaxa of the Armeno-Iberian march of Gogarene and grandson through his mother of the first Christian King of Iberia, Meribanes (Mirian) III (284-361).⁹⁰ Caucasian, especially Armenian, military leadership was quite conspicuous in the age of Justinian, and at that time quite out of proportion with the Caucasian output of manpower, with over a score of commanders fighting in the Emperor's wars, west and east.⁹¹ Thereafter, from the end of the Justinianic epoch and until the end of the Basilid, Armenians formed—it would hardly be an exaggeration to say—an overwhelming majority both at Court and in the Imperial service, especially in the armed forces. In perusing the pages of the Byzantine historians dealing with the period in question, one is struck by the fact that almost the only personages mentioned are men of Armenian, and generally Caucasian, origin.⁹² What one sees is tantamount to a peaceful conquest of Byzantium by Caucasia.

But what is more, not only individual Caucasians thus attained prominence in the Empire; many, especially Armenians, also founded Byzantine families, which enjoyed a high social position and possessed great landed estates, particularly in Anatolia, i.e., in the immediate vicinity of Caucasia. These families supplied political leadership to the Empire, and, in the first place, produced

but also by the *émigrés*, likewise nobles and perhaps even men of less exalted social standing, who came from Free Caucasia and even from the Iranian zone of it. Thus, the prince Bacurius (*infra* at nn. 88-90) was in the Roman service at the moment when his dynasty's principedom of Gogarene and its suzerain, the Crown of Iberia were fully under the aegis of the Iranian empire: *Studies* 150 (for Iberia's dependence on Iran) and 499 (for Gogarene's dependence on Iran). Another prince of the Iberian royal house, Peranius, exchanged Iranian for Roman allegiance: Procopius, *Bell. goth.* 5.5.3; *infra* Appendix A (b) No. 1. The same was the case of the Arsacid princes Artabanus and John (*Bell. vand.* 4.24.1-2; Appendix A [a] Nos. 1, 2); the Kamsarakan princes Narses, Aratius, and Isaac (*Bell. pers.*, 1.12.21-22; 1.15.31-33; Appendix A [a] Nos. 4, 5, 6), as well as of others, including the great Narses: *Bell. pers.* 1.15.31.

⁸⁸ Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* 10.11.

⁸⁹ P. Peeters, 'Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques,' *Analecta Bollandiana* 50 (1932) 27-38. It is difficult, however, to accept Fr. Peeters' identification of Bacurius: cf. the following note.

⁹⁰ Toumanoff, *Chronology of the Early Kings of Iberia* at nn. 132-145. Bacurius was in the Roman service until about 394 and then succeeded to the throne of Gogarene. — For the title of Vitaxa (Arm. *bdeax*/Georg. *pilitax*), see *Studies* 154-8; for the Vitaxae of Gogarene, *ibid.* 183-92. 260-4, 467-75.

⁹¹ *Infra* Appendix A.

⁹² *Infra* Appendix B.

the commanding personnel for the Imperial armies. Mention should be made here of the Houses of Curcuas, Dalassenus, Maniaces, and Sclerus, as also of the mediatized Mamikonid branches of Musele and Crinites and the mediatized Bagratid branches of Taronites and Tornices.⁹³ Adontz thought it possible to suggest that the celebrated House of Ducas was another mediatized branch of the Mamikonid Dynasty;⁹⁴ and it seems indubitable that another great house, that of Phocas, if not of Armenian origin agnatically, must have been Armenianized through marital alliances, to the point of using the typically Armenian *praenomen* of Vard (Bardas).⁹⁵

⁹³ For the Curcuas: Charanis, *Armenians* 36-7. The name may be a derivation of the *praenomen* Gurgēn, for Armenian historians occasionally use the latter for Curcuas: Adontz, *Ašot Erkat'* 283. — The Dalasseni: Adontz, 'Notes arméno-byzantines, V: Les Dalassènes,' reprinted in *Études arméno-byzantines* 163-77; Charanis 45-6. — The Maniaces: Charanis 35, 46. — The Scleri: *ibid.* 42, 37. — The Musele-Crinitae: Adontz, *Taronites* (*supra* n. 59) 225-9; Charanis 40-1. — The Taronitae and Tornicii: Adontz, *Taronites*; Charanis 46-7. Other Armenian families in Byzantium included the Brachamii (Adontz, *Notes arm.-byz.* III: La famille de Philarète 147-52; Charanis 47); the Burtzae (Charanis 45); the Cecaumeni (P. Lemerle, *Prolegomènes à une édition critique et commentée des 'Conseils et Récits' de Kékauménos* [Brussels 1960]; 'Nouvelles remarques sur la famille Vichkatzi-Kékauménos,' *Revue des ét. armén.* 3 [1966] 177-83; also *ibid.* 5.141-4; H. Bartikian, 'La généalogie du Magistros Bagrat, Catépan de l'Orient, et des Kékauménos,' *ibid.* 2 [1965] 261-72; Charanis 47; — it is to be regretted that Bartikian should have assumed the existence of a 'nom de famille *κισκάσης*, mentionné par le Porphyrogénète [*De adm. imp.* 46]' and then attempted through various 'emendations' to identify this presumed family with the Vixkac'i-Cecaumeni [pp. 265-266], without realizing that the term used by Constantine was, so far from being a family name, merely the sobriquet of an Iberian Bagratid, Ašot II the Prompt [*kiskasi*], Duke of Artanuži-Cholarzene/Klarjet'i, † 939: my *Bagr. of Iberia* p. 30 No. 29); the Curticii (Charanis 44-45); the Machetarli (Adontz, *Notes I: Les sceaux des Makhitar* 137-41; Charanis 47); and the Theodorocani (Adontz, *Notes IV: La famille de Théodorokan* 153-62). On the other hand, the Armenian origin of the Melissenii, occasionally asserted, seems to be far from certain: Charanis 46 n. 173. Mention should be made here of two Georgian families, the Apocapae (S. Vryonis, 'The Will of a Provincial Magnate. . .,' *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 [1957] 274-5; Charanis 47-8) and the Pacuriani (Honigsmann, *Ostgrenze* 222-6; Charanis 47-8). For other short-lived families, see *infra*, Appendix B.

⁹⁴ Adontz, 'Les fonds historiques de l'épopée byzantine Digénis Akritas,' *Études arméno-byzantines* pp. 14-5: the family name may possibly have been a derivation of *dux* as a rendering of the Mamikonid office-fief of High Constable (*sparapet*) of Armenia.

⁹⁵ Charanis, *Armenians* pp. 37-9. One may wonder, however, why various men bearing the *Christian name* of Phocas — there have been several St. Phocases — should have been adduced (p.37) in connection with the origins of the *family* of that name. The claim of that family to be descended from the Fabii (Aitaliates [Bonn 1853] 217-22) though obviously a *chimère*, stresses at any rate its origin in the *partes Occidentis* and thus militates against the implication of the *praenomen* Vard. On the other hand, the parallel (maternal?) descent also claimed by the family from some Iberians brought — likewise — from the West by Constantine the Great and settled in the region, once inhabited by the Assyrians, the Medes,

More importantly still, in the Middle Byzantine phase, a number of Armenians attempted or reached the Imperial throne. Among the former, Baanes (636), Mezezius, of the princely house of Gnuni (668-669) and his son John; Bardanes 'the Turk' (803), Bardas Sclerus (976-979), George Maniaces (1043), and Leo Tornices (1047) should be mentioned;⁹⁶ among the latter, Philippicus-Bardanes (711-713), Artabasdos (742-743), who appears to have been a Mamikonid, Leo V (813-820), most likely another Gnuni, and John I Tzimiskes (969-976).⁹⁷ And what is most important of all, three Imperial dynasties — two of them among the greatest in Byzantine history — were founded by Armenians: the Heraclians (610-711), the Basilids (876-1056), and the Lecapeni (920-945).

The Heraclians were related to the Arsacids of Armenia and came from the Arsacid principedom of Carenitis, in the Western Kingdom.⁹⁸ The Basilids,

and then the Armenians, seems to point to Caucasian, rather than Pyrenean, Iberia; the tracing of this line of descent to the West may have been influenced by the consciousness of the western origin of the family in the paternal line. The name Vard, being Armenian and not Georgian, may, in conjunction with the Iberian maternal descent, point to the Armeno-Georgian marchland of Tayk'-Tao.

⁹⁶ Cf. Charanis, *Armenians* 21-2, 42, 46; Appendix B Nos. 6, 19, 20, 46, 149, 177, and 180.

⁹⁷ Cf. Charanis, *Armenians* 22, 23, 36-7; Appendix B Nos. 17, 26, 55, 158. — It is difficult to see why historians should omit from the lists of the Emperors Artabasdos (742-743) and his son and co-Emperor Nicephorus. Artabasdos fulfilled what constitutional requirements there were for making a lawful Emperor (cf. *infra* n. 131): he exercised the Imperial power in the capital, having been proclaimed by (as ever, a part of) the armed forces and accepted by the people and the senate of Constantinople. His case is similar to that of Basiliscus (475-476), who does figure in such lists; cf. e.g., G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, transl. J. Hussey (Oxford 1968) 578.

⁹⁸ Eusebius (Sebēos) speaks of the descendants of the royal Arsacids of Armenia (Aršakuni, for whom see *Studies* 192-6) as relatives (*merjawork'*) of the Emperor Constans II: *History* 32 (ed. Tiflis 1913) 188. (Actually, the text is somewhat unclear, since in Classical Armenian *iwr* can mean both *suus* and *eius*. It thus states that the Emperor maintained Smbat V Bagratuni in the dignities of his [*iwroy*] father, made him Drungary of his [*iwroc'*] forces, gave him as wife a princess of the house of the Arsacids, his [*iwroc'*] relatives, and sent him to the camp of his [*iwr*] army. Now, it is obvious that the *iwroy* modifying 'father' has the sense of *eius*, and it is equally obvious that the *iwroc'* and *iwr* modifying 'forces' and 'army' have that of *suus*. The sense of *iwroc' merjaworac'*, though ambiguous grammatically, can also be established in the historical context. For a Bagratid to marry a mediatized Arsacid would have been so normal as to require no comment. Therefore, the fact that the Emperor arranged this marriage, as part of a series of honors showered upon Smbat V, must mean that these Arsacids were not the Bagratid prince's relatives but the Emperor's.) On the basis of Theophylactus Sim. 3.1 and 3.6, A. Pernice concludes that the Emperor Heraclius I's father was born 'probabilmente in Carin (Theodosiopolis)': *L'imperatore Eraclio* (Florence 1905) 25 and n. 1. He was, accordingly, born on the territory of the Western Kingdom; and Carenitis was the principality of the Arsacids on its territory: *supra*, n. 21. The references to Heraclius I's golden hair are in no way 'contradictory' to the assertion of his Armenian

usually misnamed 'Macedonians,' may, as the exhaustive investigations of Adontz have shown, have been an impoverished *émigré* offshoot of the Mamikonids.⁹⁹ The Lecapeni are believed by some to have been an impoverished branch of the Princes of Gabeljank'.¹⁰⁰ Finally, there was the side-dynasty of almost certain Mamikonids, to which the Empress Theodora, wife of Theophilus, and her brother Caesar Bardas belonged.¹⁰¹

Insofar as cultural leadership is concerned, one may recall the names of Armenians by origin, like Caesar Bardas, John the Grammarian, Genesius Maniaces, as well as the Emperors Leo VI and Constantine VII, and of half-Armenians, like Leo the Philosopher and Photius, in connexion with the re-establishment of the University of Constantinople and with the intellectual activity of the Amorion and Basilid periods.¹⁰² Mention should also be made here of the numerous Georgian, especially Iberian, monastic foundations established throughout the Empire and, in particular, of the Iviron Monastery on Mt. Athos.¹⁰³ It was at the Iviron that the literary activity of its Abbot, St. Euthymius († 1028) enriched Byzantine (and ultimately also Western) hagiography with the Life of Barlaam and Ioasaph, a Christianized version

origin (A. Vasiliev, *History of the Byzantine Empire* [Madison 1952] 193): there have been blond Armenians, and, at any rate, Armenian origin does not preclude a possible admixture of other ethnic strains. All this, however, does not necessarily mean that the Heraclians were of Arsacid origin; see *infra* Appendix C.

⁹⁹ Adontz, 'L'âge et l'origine de l'empereur Basil I (867-886),' reprinted in *Études arméno-byzantines* 47-109. It cannot be urged too strongly that the misnomer — the *vox nihili* (Bussell II 408) — 'Macedonian Dynasty' be replaced by a more adequate name, e.g., precisely, 'Basilid'; for, by the same token, the Heraclians might be called — as absurdly — 'African Dynasty.' — It is not a little odd, in the face of the assertions of the *Vita Basilii* and the exhaustive research of Adontz, to note that Professor Ostrogorsky should still find it appropriate to write that 'it is also far from certain that he [*scil.* Basil I] was of Armenian extraction': *History* 232 n. 2.

¹⁰⁰ K. Tēr-Sahakean, *Hay Kayserk' Biwzandioni* II (Venice 1905) 35. For the House of Gabeljean, Princes of Gabeljank', see *Studies* 220-21. — In the case of the Lecapeni, as in the case of the Basilids, the modest conditions surrounding the founder of the dynasty before his rise to power need not mean undistinguished origin; the vicissitudes of history have often been responsible for the phenomenon of impoverished, but aristocratic *émigrés*. Constantine VII's uncomplimentary reference to Romanus I as 'a common, illiterate fellow' (*De adm. imp.* 13.150) is to be taken with a grain of salt: he obviously had no love for his prepotent father-in-law and was, moreover, hard put to it in explaining away the Bulgarian *mésalliance*, which the other had allowed. It is also to be borne in mind that the predominance in Byzantine society of the highly class-conscious Caucasian aristocracy (*infra* at nn. 122-5) would hardly have made possible the rise to prominence of a *homo novus* from Caucasia.

¹⁰¹ Adontz, *Age et origine* 106, 107-8; *Studies* 210.

¹⁰² Charanis, *Armenians* 25, 27-8.

¹⁰³ M. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte der kirchlichen georgischen Literatur* (Studi e Testi 185; Vatican City 1955) 61-5, 69-78.

of a Buddhist theme.^{103a} If, moreover, the identity, proposed by some scholars, of Peter the Iberian with Pseudo-Dionysius¹⁰⁴ be assumed as proved, the extent of Caucasian influence on the religious and philosophical thought not only of Byzantium, but also of the West, must be regarded as quite enormous indeed.

* * *

Now it would appear only natural that military, political, social, and to some extent also cultural prominence of the Armenians, and generally Caucasians, in the Empire, as well as their considerable demographic contribution, in other words, both Leadership and Manpower, should have left an imprint—the second aspect of their active role—on Byzantine society and civilization.

The domain of art, alas, seems reluctant to yield a clear indication of this imprint. The chief art of Caucasia is architecture. The divisive parochialism, already alluded to, often creates the impression, by concentrating on one to the exclusion of the other, that Armenian architecture and Georgian architecture are different and distinct. In reality, they are but two aspects, often overlapping, though each possessed of its own peculiarities, of one Caucasian architecture. Its roots deep in the Urartian past, it grew under influences from Syria, Iran, and the Hellenistic world, yet remained wholly original. With its concern with the plastic and the geometric — its interplay of the austerity of polished stone surfaces and the high ornamentation of chiselled stone — its intentional dissociation of the internal and external plans: its conception, that is, of the outside as independent of the inside (and the conically or pyramidally roofed dome is an example of this) and the equal attention paid to both; its inchoate elements of the Gothic style; its introduction of the drum-supported dome; and, its own stonework technique, it is distinct alike from Byzantine, Iranian, Syrian, and Anatolian architecture.

^{103a} Cf. Lang, *The Balavariani (Barlaam and Josaphat): A Tale from the Christian East* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1966); *The Wisdom of Balahvar: A Christian Legend of the Buddha* (London and New York 1957); Tarchnišvili, *Gesch. georg. Lit.* 394-95. For St. Euthymius: *ibid.* 126-54. For a persistence of an older and different view: F. Dölger in *CMH* IV 2.242-43.

¹⁰⁴ Especially by Honigsmann and Š. Nucubiġe, cf. Tarchnišvili, *Geschichte* 246-8, for a summary of the arguments in favour of this identification, as well as Nucubiġe's more recent work, *Istoriġa gruzinskoġ filosofii* (Tiflis 1960) 84-107. — For Peter's family background, see *Studies* 260-61. — Of more importance for the Byzantinists than for Byzantium itself is the fact that a number of Greek texts, lost in the original, have been preserved in Armenian and Georgian versions. Suffice it to recall here Eusebius of Caesarea's *Chronicle*, which has reached us in its entirety in an Armenian version. For the Georgian translations of now lost Greek works, see E. Xint'k'iġe, 'Korneli Kekeliġe da bizantiur-k'art'uli literaturuli urt'iert'obis sakit'xebi,' *Mnat'obi* 11 (1969) 181-5.

The most recent research has failed to establish the fact of either decisive Byzantine influence on Armenia or decisive Armenian influence on Byzantium in this matter.¹⁰⁶ And this, even though Armenian architects are known to have worked in Byzantium, like Tiridates of Ani who, after the earthquake of 989, rebuilt the dome of the church of the Holy Wisdom.¹⁰⁶ This can possibly be explained by the religious differences which existed between Armenia and Byzantium; for indeed some monuments erected by those Armenians who were favorable to the Chalcedonian dogma appear to have undergone some noticeable Byzantine influence.¹⁰⁷

It is in the socio-political domain that Caucasian, and especially Armenian, influence may be detected as having left an imprint on Byzantine society and

¹⁰⁶ *Architettura medievale armena* (Rome 1968). This publication, accompanying the exhibition (held from 10 to 30 June 1968 in the Palazzo Venezia, in Rome) of splendid photographs, is, like them, the result of two missions to Armenia, made (in 1966 and 1967) under the auspices of the Medieval Section of the Institute of the History of Art of the Faculty of the Letters of the University of Rome. It contains the following essays (after a Preface by Professor Géza de Frankovich, Director of the Institute of the History of Art): F. de Maffei, 'La civiltà figurativa armena'; H. Kh. Vahramian, 'Architetti e maestri costruttori nell'Armenia medievale'; T. Breccia Fratadocchi, 'Componenti religiose e simboliche dell'architettura medievale armena'; P. Cuneo, 'Introduzione all'architettura armena'; *idem*, 'L'architettura armena del primo periodo: IV-VII sec.'; E. Costa, 'L'architettura armena del secondo periodo: IX-XIV sec.' For the originality of this architecture, see especially F. de Maffei 14-16 (the stonework), 19-23 (the dome); Breccia Fratadocchi 42-5; for the impossibility (as yet) of determining respective influences of Armenia and Byzantium: especially E. Costa 65. Last but not least, cf. Der Nersessian, *Armenia* 55-89. To the classical presentation of Professor Der Nersessian, several new facts may be added. Recent excavations at Volizaberd appear to have brought to light a fourth-century Arsacid sepulchral monument with a dome on pendentives over a square bay (F. de Maffei in *Architettura mediev. armena* 19); accordingly, an important part of Strzygowski's celebrated thesis, hitherto believed unproved (Der Nersessian, *op. cit.* 57), seems vindicated. The Italian mission of 1967 discovered a hitherto unknown domed church at Soradir in Vaspurakan which F. de Maffei dates (20; cf. also 98 and Plates 56-58), as probably of the first decade of the sixth century. And recent investigations would seem to indicate that the original dome of the Cathedral of Ejmiacin, dating from 480, was of stone and not of wood: A. Sahinian, 'Recherches scientifiques sous les voûtes de la cathédrale d'Etchmiadzine,' *Revue des études arméniennes* 3 (1966) 39-71, esp. 62. — For a suggestion of Byzantino-Georgian connections in the field of architecture and sculpture, see D. Winfield, 'Some Early Medieval Figure Sculpture from North-East Turkey,' *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 31 (1968) 71-2.

¹⁰⁶ *Archit. mediev. armena* 25-6, 61-2, 64-5; Der Nersessian, *Armenia* 79.

¹⁰⁷ A notable example of Byzantine influence is the great Cathedral of the Angels (*Zuart'-noe'*), at Vaġaršapat, built by the Katholikos Nerses III the Builder (642-662): *Arch. med.*, F. de Maffei 23-5; P. Cuneo 58; E. Costa 64; E. Costa and P. Cuneo, 'Schede degli edifici' 102 (and bibliography). For the religious policy of Nerses III, see Grousset, *Histoire* 297-304; G. Garitte, *La Narratio* 339 (and bibliography); Toumanoff, 'Christian Caucasia between Byzantium and Iran: New Light from Old Sources,' *Traditio* 10 (1954) 159.

civilization. Three factors in particular may manifest this imprint: the thematic system, the rise of the quasi-feudal aristocracy in Anatolia, and the growth of successional legitimism.

Before turning to the fusion of standing army and provincial administration, known as the thematic system, it may be recalled that the office of Presiding Prince, introduced in Iberia by the Emperor Maurice in 588, was the Caucasian equivalent of the office of Exarch — of Italy and of Africa — ascribed to the same Emperor and, as it were, prefiguring that system. Each office, however, had had its own distinct prehistory; and this fact must preclude any theory about transplanting an unique institution from one end of the Empire to the other. The tendency to combine the civil and military powers in single hands had obtained in the Empire from the days of Justinian I.¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, already within two decades after the abolition of the Armenian Monarchy in 428, the Great Kings had begun occasionally to appoint local Princes as their Viceroys of Armenia, a practice which continued to 628; and, what is more, the special autonomy granted to Armenia in 485-509 implied the necessary conferment of the viceroyship upon a local prince.¹⁰⁹ The Iranian office of Viceroy (*marzpān*) by itself combined both powers, and so also did, as sovereigns, the Caucasian Princes.¹¹⁰ The conjunction of the two institutions, Iranian *marzpanate* and Caucasian princship, necessary in the years 485-509, thus set the pattern for the purely Caucasian office of Presiding Prince. Quite obviously, in Iberia, the Emperor Maurice merely adopted the extant pattern and revived the permanent character of that conjunction.

Although each office, Presiding Prince and Exarch, was the result of its own, distinct institutional prehistory, it may nevertheless be presumed that one of them, the one which was the first to receive its definitive shape, may well have stimulated the final form of the other. Only under this aspect can the influence of one office upon the other be considered. We have just seen that the beginnings of the Caucasian Principate, as an institution, can be dated as of the years 485-509. We are not, however, very clear about the beginnings of the Byzantine Exarchate: to the extent at least that, failing an Imperial act of institution, it is impossible to say whether the first recorded reference to an exarch (October 584)¹¹¹ concerns a definitively constituted office or as

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Stein, *Hist. du Bas-Empire* II 466-80; Bury, *Later Rom. Emp.* II 338-43.

¹⁰⁹ Lazarus 98-9; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* 229-33; CMH IV 1.600-7, 780; and, for correct chronology, Manandian (Manandyan), *K'nnakan lesul'yun Hay lojovrdi patmut'yan* II/2 (Erevan 1960) 387, 388 (CMH IV 780 is to be corrected accordingly).

¹¹⁰ For the office of *Marzpān*: Christensen, *Iran Sass.* 136-9; for the Princes: *infra* at nn. 119, 120.

¹¹¹ JK 1052.

yet an *ad hoc* arrangement (which had begun already with Narses).¹¹² In the circumstances, the Caucasian Principate appears to have received its definitive shape the first.

The thematic system was another, parallel, result of the Roman tendency to fuse the two powers. Nevertheless, here too, one may speculate as to what effect as a stimulant, what imprint, may have been exercised upon its final form by the same Caucasian office of Presiding Prince. For although the date of the formation of the earliest, and prototypal, themes, especially the Opsician and the Armeniac, is still a matter of dispute,¹¹³ it must at any rate be posterior to the year 588, when the Principate was introduced in Iberia, and, not impossibly, even to 628 and 635, when it was introduced in Albania and in Armenia, respectively. The Caucasian office, no less than the Exarchate, may thus have served as the model for the Armeniac Theme, which lay in the immediate vicinity of Caucasia and was formed with predominantly Armenian troops, on a territory largely inhabited by Armenians.¹¹⁴

Next, there is the problem of the emergence of the quasi-feudal families of Anatolia in the ninth and tenth centuries, which went counter to the very nature of Byzantine society. It hardly needs stressing here that nobility, i.e., an official, hereditary, privileged body, and one, moreover, animated by a definite ethos, was unknown in the East Roman polity; its ruling stratum

¹¹² Stein, *Hist. du Bas-Empire* II 615. — It may presumably be argued that the Exarchate became a fixed office only after the disappearance of the Praetorian Prefects of Italy and of Africa (in the seventh century: RE 22/2 s.v. 'Praefectus Praetorio' 2496-8); cf. RE 6/2 1552-3 s.v. 'Exarchos.'

¹¹³ See, for the literature on this subject, Ostrogorsky, *History* 96 n. 1 and 101 n.1. — While it seems beyond dispute that the earliest themes were formed by Heraclius, there is nothing in what Theophanes has to say, a. 6113, about the Emperor's going into the 'region of the themes,' to compel one to conclude that the thematic system had already been formed by 622. The word *θέμα* was 'the normal term for a division of troops' prior to the formation of that system (Ostrogorsky 97; cf. L. Bréhier, *Les institutions de l'empire byzantin* [Paris 1943] 121); in fact, it translated 'legion' (DuCange, *Gloss. graec.* 487). Accordingly a reference to a theme need tell us nothing. It is true, however, that the expression *ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν θεμάτων χώρας* may be taken to suggest the existence of the system in question. And yet, it can well be supposed that Theophanes used this expression proleptically, in the light of the realities of his own day (cf. his reference to Justinian's general Narses as *ἐξαρχος* 'Ρωμαίων: a. 6044). Nor need any mention of a commanding officer of such a 'division of troops' prove by itself anything in particular. Accordingly, it can be supposed that the *Comes Obsequii* ('Ὀμπικίον<ὄψαξιον') of 626 as mentioned in the *Chron. Pasch.*, and the Turmarch of the Armeniacs of 627, in Theophanes, were, respectively, the commander of the *Imp. Obsequium* and a 'lieutenant-general' of the troops (once) commanded by the *Magister militum per Armeniam*, which army units were then mustered for the Iranian war and only later — after the final victory and along with other measures of re-organization (such, for instance, as the setting up of the office of Presiding Prince in Armenia) — gradually transformed into themes in the specific sense of units of provincial administration.

¹¹⁴ Charanis, *Armenians* 19-20.

consisting of the Emperor and the officialdom.¹¹⁵ What is often loosely spoken of as Byzantine aristocracy, or, quite erroneously, as Byzantine nobility, was *de jure* a non-hereditary group of officials — some of them might be possessed of great fortunes, often in land, which of course, like all private property, were inheritable — bearing non-inheritable dignities and being of most varied provenance. East Roman society was largely one of self-made men,¹¹⁶ and thus one in which, in the Late Roman and at the beginning of the Middle Byzantine phase, there was an almost total absence of family names. This is not to say, however, that in that society there did not exist tendencies to monopolize positions of power or that there did not evolve certain inchoate features which might have resulted (though in the event they did not) in the formation of a feudal nobility.¹¹⁷ Yet all this was, in the words of Ernest Stein, 'une espèce de féodalisme voilé.'¹¹⁸

Quite different was the social structure of Caucasia, which was intensely nobiliary. Its salient feature was its uppermost layer of dynastic princes, which represented a survival of theophanic tribal dynasts of more ancient, Urartian and pre-Urartian times. These Princes were older than kingship,

¹¹⁵ Bréhier, *Institutions* 89-93, 153-4; Ensslin in CMH IV 2.9-10, 18-19; Jenkins, *ibid.* 80, 99 ('The very existence of an aristocracy of birth was anomalous').

¹¹⁶ Stein, *Introduction* (note 2 *supra*) 129-30.

¹¹⁷ Such a feature was the feudalistic tendencies displayed by the higher military and civil officialdom in conjunction with the possession of latifundia and governmental concessions, like the *πρόνοια*: Ensslin, CMH IV 2.33, 41-2; Stein, *Introduction* 129-34; Vasiliev, *Hist. Byz. Emp.* 563-79. Yet it was 'une espèce de féodalisme voilé,' in which 'les grands propriétaires... n'exercent leurs pouvoirs quasi-féodaux qu'en tant que fonctionnaires. C'est seulement dans le sens d'empléments progressifs faits par des pouvoirs locaux tirant leur origine de conditions de droit privé, sur des prérogatives existantes de l'État qu'il faut comprendre les deux processus de féodalisation que l'Empire byzantin a subis successivement, le premier arrêté et défailt par les réformes d'Héraclius, le second détruisant lentement les effets de celles-ci': Stein pp. 130-31. These tendencies thus never passed beyond this embryonic stage; not even in the Palaeologan phase, when they did evolve into an aristocracy (as has been shown by Charanis, 'On the Social Structure and Economic Organization of the Byzantine Empire in the Thirteenth Century and Later,' *Byzantinoslavica* 12 [1951] 94-154, and 'The Aristocracy of Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century,' *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson* [Princeton 1951] 336-58), — an aristocracy some features of which were influenced by the West, but which nevertheless never became a true nobility. The powers of this would-be nobility were never transmuted into constitutional rights of an officially instituted hereditary nobility, as in Caucasia, Sassanid Iran, or the West. It is impossible to consider the *curiales* of the Late Roman phase as 'une espèce de noblesse provinciale' (Stein 128), since they admittedly did not form the highest stratum in society; and as for that stratum, i.e., the senatorial order, the fact that its hereditary character did not last *de jure* beyond the third generation militates against its being an equivalent of a nobility.

¹¹⁸ *Introduction* 130-1, cf. the preceding note.

which was an outgrowth of their *milieu*, emerging at the moment when one of them had achieved hegemony among his compeers. The Caucasian princely States were self-sufficient and self-determined units, because territorialized tribes and clans of old; and therefore also each a theophanic microcosm. And the Caucasian Princes were fully sovereign, vested with full executive, legislative, judicial, and fiscal powers, commanding their own armed forces, and competent to negotiate with foreign States. As a result, the Caucasian kingdoms were largely federations of principalities, presided over by the Kings. To gain an idea of the power of these Princes, it should be mentioned that the feudal aid of the greater Armenian dynasts to their overlord the King amounted to 1,000 horse.¹¹⁹ Accordingly, the Kings could never claim, with regard to the Princes, a position other than that of a *primus inter pares*. Of Byzantine autocracy, there was never a trace in Caucasia.¹²⁰ Below this restricted and closed princely caste, there was the larger body of the lesser nobility, knights and squires, vassals of the Princes or, in some cases, directly of the King, who manned the cavalry of the realm.¹²¹ In contrast to East Roman society, Caucasian society had early developed a complex system of nobiliary family names.¹²²

Now the Caucasians who entered the service of the Empire were for the most part representatives of this nobiliary society, and often of its upper, dy-

¹¹⁹ *Studies* 33-144, 234-41; CMH IV 1.595-6.

¹²⁰ This was the basal régime of Caucasia, which may be termed dynasticist. The Crown, however, had, from the start, attempted to increase its ascendancy over the Princes. In this way, to the purely political dependence of the dynast upon the super-dynast, or king, certain feudal features were added. What the Crown was powerless to reduce by force, it endeavoured to control by sanction; it had to admit the princely rights, but it tended to regard them as of its own delegation. Accordingly all the Armenian and some of the Iberian Princes were, from the point of view of the Crown, dukes, ruling their territories and commanding their armies in the service of the King. Moreover, in both the Armenian and the Iberian Monarchy, many dynasts were enfeoffed of great offices of the State and of the Court: *Studies* 34-40, 96-9, 112-9; CMH IV 1.596.

¹²¹ *Studies* 93-4, 124-7; CMH IV 1.596.

¹²² *Studies* 129-30. — Fundamentally, the autocratic and bureaucratic Roman State and the dynasticist and feudal society of Caucasia were mutually incompatible. The Byzantine treatment of the dynasts in the Caucasian lands annexed to the Empire, as is revealed in the complaints of the West Armenian Princes addressed to Chosroes I (Procopius, *Bell. pers.* 2.3.32-39), and a *fortiori* the very fact of annexationism, which meant the dispossession of the dynasts like the Pentarchs, made the Caucasian Princes, though Christians, gravitate to the aristocratic empire of Iran. And this threw the Caucasian Kings into the arms of the Emperor, who was for them not only the meta-political secular head of Christendom, but also a pleasing example of anti-nobiliary autocracy with which, before their eyes, to oppose the Princes. It was in the context of this tension, as well as that between Rome and Iran, that the Armenian Monarchy was abolished in 428, and the Iberian in 580. Cf. *Studies* 151-3; CMH IV 1.597-9, 602-03; cf. Grousset, *Histoire* pp. 260-1.

nastic, layer. One hears of the Arsacids, the Chosroids, the Mihranids, the Mamikonids, the Bagratids, the Kamsarakans, the Gyunis supplying military leadership to the Empire.¹²³ Bussell speaks well of the 'proud and independent spirit' of 'that princely caste who offered themselves to the emperors almost on equal terms.'¹²⁴ And the success of the Caucasians in the Imperial service and in East Roman society must, largely, have been due to precisely the confrontation of two different social conceptions. This was an encounter of, on the one hand, the forcefulness of family solidarity, enhanced by a consciousness of the superiority of birth, and, on the other, the indecision of the official negation of birth and heredity that was at odds, even in that society of self-made men, with the natural tendencies towards both. In this encounter, too, the Caucasians were strengthened by the natural sense of ethnic and social solidarity, as opposed to the somewhat artificial unity of East Roman society, which reposed on political allegiance and on varying degrees of the presumed linguistic, cultural, and religious conformity.¹²⁵

Having all this in view, it is rather difficult not to see a manifestation of the Caucasian social conception in the rise, in the ninth and tenth centuries, of the Anatolian 'powerful.'¹²⁶ For these families, many of them precisely the houses of Armenian origin mentioned earlier, were not merely great land-owning families, like those that existed earlier and elsewhere in East Roman society; not occupying, occasionally, great offices of the State; no longer an aristocracy, like the senatorial order of former times; but a quasi-nobiliary group of landed families which, for the first time in East Roman history, bore hereditary family names, supplied, as though it had been their hereditary oc-

¹²³ *Infra* Appendix A (a) Nos. 1-6, (b) Nos. 1-3; Appendix B *passim*.

¹²⁴ *Rom. Emp.* II 371-2, apropos of the epitaph on the sarcophagus of the Exarch Isaac, possibly a Kamsarakan, in the church of San Vitale in Ravenna, where he is referred to as Ἰσαάκιος τῶν βασιλέων ὁ σύμμαχος; Leclercq, *DACL* 14.2116.

¹²⁵ For manifestations of pride of birth and family solidarity, see Procopius, *Bell. vand.* 4.27.16, 18; *Bell. goth.* 7.32.4, 5; the Exarch Isaac's epitaph stressing his being ἐκ λαμπροῦ γένους (*supra* n. 124); and Constantine VII's emphasis on his grandfather's illustrious Armenian origin: *Vita Basilii*=Theoph. Contin. 212-16. For the impression produced on East Roman society by a Caucasian dynast, cf. *Bell. goth.* 7.31.7-10, and also Justinian's incredible clemency towards the Arsacid Artabanes, which betrayed something of a *parvenu's* awe before Blood Royal: *ibid.* 7.32.51; 7.39.8. A manifestation of ethnic solidarity is found in the case of the young Basil and the Patrician Constantine (Maniaces): Theoph. Contin. 230. Also, for ethnic exclusiveness, cf. Gregory Pacurianus' *typikon* of 1083/4 for the Monastery of Petritzos/Petriconi, in Bulgaria, in which this high Byzantine dignitary and husband of an Imperial princess bars entrance into his Georgian foundation to any Greek priest or monk: Tarchnišvili, ed. *Typikon Gregorii Pacuriani* (CSCO 144, Scr. iberici 4 [Louvain 1954]) cap. 24, 61-62 (Georgian text), 37-38 (Latin trans.); for the Greek text, cf. L. Petit, in *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 11 (1904).

¹²⁶ Cf. Jenkins, *CMH* IV 2.99-100.

cupation, military leadership to the Empire, and tended to exercise a "quasi-feudal control over the thematic troops, largely Armenian in composition, which were settled in the shadow of their expanding latifundia. In other words, though settled on Imperial territory and incorporated in East Roman society, these Caucasian families continued, and induced their non-Caucasian neighbours to adopt, the typically feudal-nobiliary way of life that was natural to their forefathers and cousins in their original homeland. And the epos of Digenis Acritas has preserved the flavor of their ethos.¹²⁷ The growing power of this Anatolian quasi-nobility quite naturally evoked the opposition of a State which conceived of society as composed only of the Autocrat and his δοῦλοι.¹²⁸ So, both this appearance of the 'powerful,' which may be regarded as a projection of Caucasian society, and the earlier one, in the sixth and seventh centuries, which was a continuation of Late Roman plutocratic bureaucracy, met with the opposition of the Crown. Both the Basilids and the earlier Heraclians, in struggling against this phenomenon, proved that the Imperial Roman tradition had, in their case, triumphed over the nobiliary tradition of Caucasia, whence they derived their own origin.

But though these two great Imperial families escaped the influence of the Caucasian social conception, they failed to resist still another factor in Byzantine society, which may be presumed to manifest an imprint of Caucasia. This is an imprint of the Caucasian political conception, and it can be seen in the rise of the sentiment of successional legitimism. The unwritten constitution of the Empire admitted, as is well known, of no hereditary succession to the Imperial office. The Emperor, as the Providential Man, was held to be the personal appointee of the gods, or of God, as the case might be, and it was through the theophanic people of Rome, or its representative the army, that the divine choice was made manifest. However, since he derived his power from the people, the Emperor also could make an Emperor, i.e., a co-Emperor with himself. It was in this way that the Imperial office could be monopolized by a family, co-optation remaining to the end the constitutional *raison d'être* of dynastic continuity. Parallel to this constitutional theory, there did develop, however, especially in the Middle Byzantine phase, a def-

¹²⁷ Cf. Adontz, 'Les fonds historiques. . .' (note 94 *supra*).

¹²⁸ Ensslin, CMH IV 2.9-10; Bréhier, *Institutions* 89. And yet this *émigré* nobility from Caucasia—Byzantium's only real nobility—made its influence felt even in official documents. Speaking at the Symposium on Byzantine society, held at Dumbarton Oaks, on 1 May 1969, on the subject of 'The Aristocracy,' Professor Ostrogorsky pointed to the difference between the spirit manifesting itself in the so-called *Strategikon* of Maurice and that found in the *Taktika* of Leo VI, on the question of the qualifications of a στρατηγός. While the former makes no reference to birth, the latter (Const. 2.21) includes εὐγένεια among the prerequisites.

inite, though extra-constitutional, feeling of legitimism, Bréhier's 'doctrine légitimiste.'¹²⁰

Now it is perhaps difficult to consider as wholly fortuitous the fact that this feeling of successional legitimism became fully apparent for the first time under the Heraclians; and the role, for instance, of the Armenian Arsacid Valentine in securing what he regarded as the legitimate succession for the boy Constans II in 641 is well known. In general, the Heraclians seem to have treated the Imperial office as something vested in their family, rather than in a person as had been the case with the earlier rulers, and of this the purposeless and purely honorific proliferation of co-Emperorship — collegial sovereignty, as distinct from co-optation of the heir — inaugurated by them, appears to be a proof.¹²⁰ The full flowering of this para-constitutional sentiment was reached under the Basilids, as can be seen in the care taken by the non-Basilid Emperors of the time to show respect for the 'rights' of the 'legitimate' Basilid boy-emperors.¹²¹ It can also be seen in the incredible innovation of the joint-rule of Zoe and Theodora;¹²² as well as in the prestige attaching to the title of Porphyrogenitus.

In Caucasia, the constitutional situation was entirely different with its dynastic monarchies of the Orontids, the Artaxiads, the Arsacids, the Pharnabazids, the Chosroids, in which the succession to kingship, no less than that to princesship, was entirely a matter of birth.¹²³ It is, therefore, not unlikely that the development of successional legitimism in Byzantium, whatever its local roots or its foundation in human psychology, was at least stimulated by the Caucasian conceptions that were imported by the Armenian Emperors and the Caucasian members of the ruling stratum.

*
* *

¹²⁰ Bréhier, *Institutions* 1-88; Ensslin, CMH IV 2.1-18.

¹²⁰ For a distinction between co-optation of the heir and collegial sovereignty, see my 'The Fifteenth-Century Bagratids and the Institution of Collegial Sovereignty in Georgia,' *Traditio* 7 (1949-1951) 204-9.

¹²¹ In view of the fact that the Byzantine Emperorship was 'an autocracy, tempered by the legal right of revolution,' it is as incorrect to speak of 'legitimate' but displaced Emperors and of successful 'usurpers' as to speak of a Byzantine 'nobility'. Cf. Bréhier, *Institutions* 5-6, 17, 23-4; Ensslin, CMH IV 2.6 ('if the *coup d'état* miscarried, he [the would-be Emperor] suffered the dishonourable death of a usurper; if it succeeded, victory was a sign that the grace of God had departed from the deposed Emperor').

¹²² The earlier Empress-regnant, Irene, at least had the decency (from the Roman constitutional point of view) to resort to the euphemism of entitling herself πιστός βασιλεύς so as to disguise the essential illegality — juridical absurdity — of a woman-imperator.

¹²³ In this, of course, Caucasia was at one with the West and with Sassanid Iran.

A great role in the shaping of Byzantino-Caucasian relations was played by religious developments. Ethnic, social, and cultural separatism with regard to the Empire and to Hellenism, which made itself felt throughout the East Mediterranean world, expressed itself also in religious separatism as well. In these circumstances, at the Council of Dvin in 555, Free Armenia rejected the Tome of Leo the Great and the Council of Chalcedon, which the Empire had accepted, and officially adhered to Monophysitism.¹³⁴ Roman Armenia, the two Georgias, and the Armenians in the Georgian sphere, remained, however, faithful to the Emperor's creed of the moment.¹³⁵ Thereafter, whenever the Empire, in its struggle with Islam, succeeded in setting up a momentary control over Free Armenia, it almost invariably attempted to impose, rather cavalierly, the faith of Chalcedon upon an unwilling population. Religious conformity was the price for Imperial aid against Islam — 'Byzance, devenue leur unique recours, leur marchandait son appui,' as Fr Peeters wrote¹³⁶ — much like what the West has been accused of doing centuries later with regard to Byzantium. And many Armenians preferred the turban.¹³⁷

In pursuance of the same policy of religious uniformity, the Empire obliged the Armenian *émigrés* passing to its service to conform, with no matter what degree of sincerity, to the Byzantine Establishment. And exactly as many retained, although in Imperial service, their social conceptions and their ethnic solidarity, some at least can be supposed to have likewise remained covertly faithful to their ethnic religion. It is, therefore, not altogether devoid of likelihood that a hidden revulsion from this enforced conformity must in some cases have made itself felt, expressing itself, for instance, in various heterodox sympathies, such as a leaning towards Iconoclasm.¹³⁸

A recent study on the Paulician movement has shown, to my mind conclusively, that this movement originated in Armenia, where it represented

¹³⁴ Garitte, *La Narratio* 130-75; Toumanoff, *Christian Caucasica* 142-5; CMH IV 1.804.

¹³⁵ *Christian Caucasica* 172-86. Albania, and even some parts of eastern Armenia, long after 555 continued to waver between Chalcedon and Dvin: *ibid.* 148-62.

¹³⁶ Peeters, *Orient et Byzance: Le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine* (Subsidia hagiographica 26; Brussels 1950) 26.

¹³⁷ The Presiding Prince of Armenia, Theodore Rštuni (*supra* n. 28), representing those who thus preferred the Caliph's to Byzantine overlordship, may well be called the Armenian Luke Notaras.

¹³⁸ Whatever has been said about the connection between Iconoclasm and Armenia, the existence in Armenia of religious art and of the conscious, intellectual defence of it (cf. S. Der Nersessian, 'Une apologie arménienne des images du septième siècle,' *Byzantion* 17 [1944] 58-87) must never be overlooked. Any connection between the Armenians and Iconoclasm, if there be any, must be sought rather in the climate of hidden revolt against the Establishment. There was, of course, a streak of anicony in Paulicianism, for which see N. Garsoian, *The Paulician Heresy: A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire* (Paris 1967).

the survival of an early Christian deviationism of the Adoptionist kind. Only later, in the ninth century, after it had found its way into the Empire, did Paulicianism acquire, possibly of inner necessity rather than through any traceable influence, certain Dualistic features.¹³⁰ The difficulties caused by the Paulicians to the Empire constitute another, this time negative, instance of the role of the Armenians in Byzantine society.

In view of all that has been said about this role, it would not perhaps be too wide of the mark to compare, with Bussell,¹⁴⁰ the role of the Armenian (and, generally, Caucasian) element in endowing with viability the Roman Imperial traditions in the East, to that played in endowing it with viability in the West, by the Germanic element.

APPENDIX A

ARMENIAN AND GEORGIAN COMMANDING OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES OF THE EMPIRE IN THE REIGN OF JUSTINIAN I, 527-565

(a) The Armenians

1. Artabanes/Artawan, Pr. Aršakuni: *Procopius*, *Bell. pers.* 2.3.25; *Bell. vand.* 4.24.1-2; 4.25.8; 4.27-28; *Bell. goth.* 7.31.7-16; 7.32; 7.39.8; 7.40.14-17; 8.24.1; 8.25.24; Marcellinus comes, *Chron.* (MGH Auct. ant. 11; 1894) add. ad ann. 547, 6.
2. John, Pr. Aršakuni: *Bell. pers.* 2.3.32; *Bell. vand.* 4.24.1-2; 4.24.15.
3. Gregory, Pr. Aršakuni: *Bell. vand.* 4.27-28.
4. Narses, Pr. Kamsarakan: *Bell. pers.* 1.12.21-22; 1.15.31; 1.19.37; *Bell. goth.* 6.13.17; 6.16.21; 6.17.3; 6.17.16; 6.18.6; 6.26.3; 6.27.16; 6.29.29.
5. Aratius/Hrahat (Phraates), Pr. Kamsarakan: *Bell. pers.* 1.12.21-22; 1.15.31; *Bell. goth.* 6.13.17; 6.16.18; 6.18.6; 6.20.3; 6.27.16; 6.29.29; 7.34.40; 7.40.34.
6. Isaac, Pr. Kamsarakan: *Bell. pers.* 1.15.32-33; *Bell. goth.* 7.13.20; 7.18.1; 7.19.7, 24, 26-30, 32, 34.
7. Adolius: *Bell. pers.* 2.3.10; 2.21.2, 18, 20; 2.25.35.
8. Arsaces/Aršak: *Bell. pers.* 2.5.11.
9. Artabanes/Artawan: *Bell. goth.* 8.8.21-28.
10. Artabazes/Artawazd: *Bell. goth.* 7.3.10, 17, 20, 21, 22; 7.4.2-9, 23-30.
11. Chanaranges: *Bell. goth.* 7.32.12; Agathias 2.6.76.
12. Gilacius: *Bell. goth.* 7.26.24-27.
13. John: *Bell. vand.* 3.17.1-2; 4.2.1; 4.3.4, 12; 4.4.9-25.
14. John Guzes: *Bell. pers.* 2.30.4; *Bell. goth.* 8.8.15, 30, 38; 8.9.13, 20; 8.10.7; 8.11.57-58; Justinian, Nov. 31.2; cf. Stein, *Hist. du Bas-Emp.* II 471 n. 2.

¹³⁹ Garsoïan, *op. cit.*: cf. my rev' n, *American Hist. Review* 74 (1969) 961-2.

¹⁴⁰ *Rom. Emp.* II 345.

15. Narses: *Bell. pers.* 1.15.31; *Bell. goth.* 6.13.16 ff.
16. Peter: *Bell. pers.* 2.15.6-8.
17. (Ursicius) Sittas/Tzittas/Zetas: *Bell. pers.* 1.12.20, 21, 22; 1.15.3-4, 6-7, 10, 12, 24, 25; 1.21.3, 9, 28; 2.3.8-27; *Cod. Just.* 1.29.5; Malalas (Bonn) 429-30, 465-6; cf. Adontz, *Armenija* 133, 138; Stein 470.
18. Thomas: *Bell. pers.* 2.30.5.
19. Varazes/Varaz: *Bell. goth.* 7.27.3, 10; 8.13.10.

(b) The Georgians

1. Perantius/Pirān (Mihrān?) Chosroid prince: *Bell. pers.* 2.24.15; 2.25.35; 2.26.25; 2.27.42; cf. *Studies* 372 n. 62.
2. Pacurius/Bakur, Chosroid prince: *Bell. goth.* 7.27.2; 8.26.4; 8.34.9-14.
3. Phazas, Chosroid prince: *Bell. goth.* 7.6.10; 7.7.3, 7; 7.28.5, 15.
4. Pharesmanes/P^rarsman: *Bell. pers.* 1.8.3.
5. Rufinus: *Bell. vand.* 4.19.1; 4.20.19.
6. Theodore: Agathias 5.1.

Note to Nos. 4, 5, and 6

The connection of the Kamsarakan Dynasty with the castle of Boḷ or Boḷberd, in Phasiane/Basean, is indicated by Lazarus of P^rarpi, 80 (323), 86 (345). At that time — the insurrection of 450-451 — there were three Kamsarakan princes, Narses, Hrahat, and Isaac, sons of Aršawir II, Prince of Siraccne/Širak and Aršarunik^r: *ibid.* 68, 74, 80, 90. There can be little doubt that the three brothers, who entered the Imperial service under Justinian, bearing the Kamsarakan *praenomina* of Narses, Aratius/Hrahat, and Isaac, the last-named of whom ceded to the Empire the castle of Βῶλον, near Theodosiopolis (*Bell. pers.* 1.15.32-33), i.e., indeed in Phasiane, were Kamsarakan princes. Cf. Stein 292 n. 1. For the Arsacid house of Kamsarakan, see *Studies* 206-7.

APPENDIX B

ARMENIANS AND GEORGIANS IN THE IMPERAL SERVICE, FROM THE END OF THE JUSTINIANIC TO THE END OF THE BASILID EPOCH (VITH-XITH CENTURIES).

One asterisk (*) marks those who attempted, or were accused of attempting, the throne; two asterisks (**) mark those who were proclaimed Emperors; and three asterisks (***), those who actually exercised the Imperial power. The Armenian and Georgian dynasts who received titles from the Court of Constantinople in their capacity as vassals of the Empire (like the Presiding Princes) are not included in this list. This list closes with the end of the Basilid epoch, which marked, precisely, the parting of the ways between Byzantium and Caucasia. Thereafter, and in many cases doubtless even earlier, families of Armenian and Georgian origin became thoroughly Byzantinized, and therefore hardly conscious of their Caucasian origins, as is clear, e.g., from the *Strategikon* of Cecaumenus. There were, however, in the post-Basilid period, a few, like Philaretus Brachamius and Gregory Pacurianus, who indeed retained the consciousness

of their Caucasian provenance, but these seem to have been exceptional cases, no longer manifestations of the 'peaceful conquest' of Byzantium by Caucasia as before. Emperors are included here only in their capacity as officials or dignitaries, prior to their elevations, and their descendants are omitted. — 'Pr. of the Bagratids,' 'Pr. of the Mamikonids' = heads of the house; 'Pr. Bagratuni,' 'Pr. Mamikonean' = cadets. Adontz = *Études arméno-byzantines* (Lisbon 1965).

temp. Maurice-Phocas, 582-610

1. Atat, Pr. Xorxoruni, *Patr(icius)*, General in Thrace: Eusebius (Sebēos), 6 (79), 20.
2. Heraclius 'the Elder,' Gen., *Patr., Ex(archus) Africae*: Theophyl. Sim. 2.3; 3.5, 6, 7, 8, 10; 3.6; Theophanes a. 6078, 6079, 6080, 6100, 6101; Seb. 6(77), 7(80), 20(111), 21(114), 24(125).
3. Isaac, Pr. Mamikonean, Gen. in Thrace: Seb. 10.
4. Muše] II, Pr. of the Mamikonids, Commander in Thrace: Seb. 8.
5. Theodosius, Pr. Xorxoruni, Gen. in Armenia: Seb. 22.

temp. Heraclius I, 610-641

6. **Baanes/Vahan, Gen.: Theoph. a. 6118, 6125, 6126. **636.
7. David, Pr. Saharuni, at Court: Seb. 29(166).
8. Isaac (Pr. Kamsarakan?), *Ex. Ital.*: Inscr., Leclerc, DACL, 14.2116.
9. Manuel, Pr. Aršakuni, *Mag(ister officiorum), Praef(ectus) Aug(ustalis) Aegypti*: Theoph. a. 6126; Seb. 34(221), 32(188); Mich. Syr. (Chabot) 2.425.
10. Mezezius/Mžēž II, Pr. Gnuni, Gen.: Theoph. a. 6118; Seb. 29(162, 166).
11. Nicetas, *Patr.*: Nicephorus, 4, 6. (nephew of 2).
12. Theodore, Gen.: Theoph. a. 6125; Nic. 7, 26. (s. of 2).
13. Theodore, *Mag.*: Nic. 29; Seb. 29(165). (s. of 12).
14. Vahan, Pr. Xorxoruni, at Court: Seb. 29(165).
15. Varaz-Tiroc' II, Pr. of the Baratids, at Court: Seb. 29(165).

temp. Constantine III—Justinian II, 641-711

16. Baanes/Vahan 'Επταδαίμων, Governor of IV Arm.: Theoph. a. 6194.
17. ***Bardanes/Vardan-Philippicus, Comm.: Theoph. a. 6203, 6204, 6205; Nic. 50, 52, 53, 54. ***711-713.
18. Barasbacurius/Varaz-Bakur, *Protospath(arius), Com(es) Obsequ(i)*: Theoph. a. 6203; Nic. 54.
19. **John (Pr. Gnuni): Mich. Syr. (Chabot) 2.455. **c. 669.
20. **Mezezius/Mžēž (III, Pr. Gnuni), *Com. Obsequ.*: Theoph. a. 6160 (*Μιζιζιος*); Mich. Syr. (Ch) 2.451; Arm. vers. (Langlois, Venice 1868) 241 (*Mžēž*). **668-669.
21. Saborius Persogenes/Šabur Aprasit'gan = Pasagnathes, *Patr., Str(ategus) Armeniacorum*: Theoph. a. 6143, 6159; Mich. Syr. (Ch) 2.451; cf. Peeters, *ΗΛΞΑΓΝΑΘΗΣ-ΠΕΡΣΟΓΕΝΗΣ*, *Recherches* I 293-309.
22. Smbat V, Pr. of the Bagratids, *Spatharocand(idatus), Drung(arius)*, Comm. in Thrace: Seb. 32(185, 188), 34(221).
23. Theodore, Gen.: Seb. 32(184, 187).
24. Theodore Myaces/Hmayeak, *Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6196, 6205; Nic. 55.
25. *Valentine, Pr. Aršakuni, *Patr., Com. Excubitorum*: Seb. 32(180-183);

Theoph. a. 6136 (*Valentinian*, so also *Anastas. Biblioth.*); Nic. 33, 34, 36; Cedrenus 1.754.

temp. Leo III - Constantine V, 717-775

26. ***Artabasdu/Artawazd (Pr. Mamikonean), *Str. Arm., Curop(alates), Com. Obsequ.*: Theoph. a. 6209, 6218, 6232, 6235; Nic. 66. ***742-743.
27. Artabasdu/Artawazd, *Domesticus Schariorum*: Theoph. a. 6235.
28. Baanes/Vahan, *Str. Bucell.*: Theoph. a. 6263.
29. Bactagius/Vaxtang, *Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6235 (*Anast. Biblioth.: Bagatangius*); Zonaras 15.5 (*Bactangius*).
30. Bardanes/Vardan, *Str. Arm.*: Theoph. a. 6263 = Bardanes/Vardan, *Patr.* (fath. of 31) Theoph. a. 6257.
31. Constantine, *Spath.*, *Protostrator* s. of Bardanes/Vardan: Theoph. a. 6257.
32. ***Nicephorus (Pr. Mamikonean), *Comm. in Thrace*: Theoph. a. 6233, 6235. Co-Emp. of 26.
33. Nicetas (Pr. Mamikonean), *Str. Anat., Monostrategus*: Theoph. a. 6234, 6235; Nic. 67, 68.
34. Tiridates/Trdat (Pr. Mamikonean), *Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6234 (*Τηριδάτην. . . ἐξάδελφον* of 26).

temp. Leo IV - Irene, 775-802

35. *Alexius Musele/Mušel (Pr. Mamikonean), *Spathar., Drung. Vigiliae, Patr., Str. Arm.*: Theoph. a. 6283, 6284, 6285. *792.
36. Artabasdu/Artawazd, Pr. Mamikonean, *Str. Anatolicon*: Leontius 34 (138); 37(155); Theoph. a. 6270.
37. Bardanes/Vardan, *Patr., Str. Thracestorum*: Theoph. a. 6291.
38. Bardanius/Vardan, *Patr., Dom. Sch.*: Theoph. a. 6288.
39. Bardas/Vard, *Str. Arm.*: Theoph. a. 6273. = (?) 30.
40. Bardas/Vard, *Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6284 = (?) Bardas/Vard (Pr. Gnuni), *Patr.*: Genes. 2.35 (fath. of 56).
41. Baristerotzes/Varaz-Tiroc* (Pr. Bagratuni?), *Str. Arm.*: Theoph. a. 6270 (*Καριστροτόζης*).
42. Constantine Artaser/Artašir, *Protospath.*: Theoph. a. 6285.
43. Gregory, s. of Muzelacius/Mušel (ak) (Pr. Mamikonean), *Patr., Com. Obsequ.*: Theoph. a. 6270, 6295.
44. Tatzates/Tačat, Pr. Anjewac'i, *Str. Bucell.*: Leont. 37(155), 39(158-161)); Theoph. a. 6270, 6274.

temp. Nicephorus I - Stauracius, 802-811

45. *Arsaber/Aršawir (Pr. Kamsarakan?), *Questor, Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6300; Genes. 1.21. *808.
46. **Bardanes/Vardan 'the Turk,' *Patr., Str. Anat., Arm., Ops., Thraces., Bucell.*: Theoph. a. 6295, 6296; Theoph. Contin. 6, 8; Genes. 1.8-10. **803.
47. Bardanius/Vardan Anemas, *Spathar.*: Theoph. a. 6299.

temp. Michael I - Theophilus, 811-842

48. Alexius Musele/Mušel (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Patr., Anthypatus, Mag., Dux Siciliae*, Caesar: Th. Contin. 107-8; Symeon Mag. 630-632; Geo. Mo-

- nach. (Contin.) 794-6; Leo Grammat. 450-451; Cedr. 1.918. (*Κρηνίτης*, as found in *De adm. imp.* 43, 50, seems preferable to *Κρηνίτης*).
49. Bardas/Vard, *Str. Thraces.*: *Vit. Theod. Stud.* (PG) 300.
 50. Barsacius/Varaz-Sahak (Isaac), *Patr.*: Genes. 2.35.
 51. Christopher, *Mag.*: Genes. 2.35 (fath. of 50 and 59).
 52. Constantine Babutzicus, *Mag., Drung. Vigil.*: Th. Contin. 175; Sym. Mag. 639; Geo. Mon. 805; Cedr. 1.932, 961.
 53. Constantine Maniaces, *Drung. Vigil., Patr., Logothetes Dromi*: Th. Cont. 150, 198, 229, 230; Genes. 4.81, 88-9, 101, 106-7; Sym. Mag. 667, 681; Geo. Mon. 835; Leo Gram. 461, 468; Cedr. 1.994.
 54. Gregory Pterotas: Th. Cont. 57-8, 62-3; Cedr. 1.884. (*ἀδελφιδῶς* of 55).
 55. ***Leo (Pr. Gnuni), *Str. Anat., Patr.*: Theoph. a. 6304, 6305; Th. Cont. 12; Anon. *Vit. Leonis*; Genes. 1.4; cf. *Studies* 200-1 (n. 228), 205. ***813-820.
 56. Leo Sclerus, *Str. Peloponnesi*: Anon. *Vit. Leonis* (PG) 428.
 57. Manuel (Pr. Mamikonean) 'the Amalecite,' *Protostr., Str. Arm., Dom. Sch., Str. Anat., Patr., Mag.*: Th. Cont. 18, 24, 110, 119-21, 127, 148-9, 168; Genes. 3.52, 62, 68; Sym. Mag. 630; Geo. Mon. 796-9, 802-3; Leo Gram. 451-4; Cedr. 1.920, 921, 922, 925, 926, 927, 928, 933, 934, 939, 940, 941, 942, 947, 948, 956, 958.
 58. Marinus (Pr. Mamikonean), *Drung., Turmarch.*: Th. Cont. 89; Cedr. 1.903.
 59. Nasar, *Patr., Str. Bucell.*: Genes. 2.35; Geo. Mon. 825; Leo Gram. 462; Cedr. 1.1030, 1031.
 60. Petronas (Pr. Mamikonean), *Str. Thraces., Drung. Vigil., Patr., Mag.*: Th. Cont. 167, 174, 179; Genes. 4.97; Sym. Mag. 666; Geo. Mon. 810, 825 (*Str. Anat.*); Leo Gram. 450, 462; Cedr. 1.955, 950, 963, 965.
 61. Theodosius Babutzicus, *Patr.*: Genes. 3.71-72; Cedr. 1.938.
 62. Theodosius Musele/Mušel (Pr. Mamikonean) Grinites, *Patr.*: Cedr. 1.919.

temp. Michael III 842-867

63. Antigonus (Pr. Mamikonean), *Dom. Sch., Patr.*: Th. Cont. 180, 205, 299; Genes. 4.105, 106; Sym. Mag. 665; Geo. Mon. 824; Leo Gram. 462; Cedr. 1.980, 983, 993. (s. of 67).
64. Arsaber/Aršawir (Pr. Kamsarakan?), *Patr., Mag.*: Th. Cont. 156, 175; Cedr. 1.961.
65. Artabasdu/Artawazd, *Hetaeriarques*: Sym. Mag. 685; Geo. Mon. 838; Leo Gram. 469.
66. Asylaes (Pr. Mamikonean), at Court: Sym. Mag. 688; Geo. Mon. 830, 837, 839; Theod. Melit. 170. (*ἐξάδελφος* of 71)
67. Bardas/Vard (Pr. Mamikonean?), *Patr., Dom. Sch., Mag., Chartularius Caniclii, Curop., Caesar*: Th. Cont. 137, 151, 167, 171, 176, 184, Genes. 4.90-91, 97; Sym. Mag. 648, 657, 658, 665; Geo. Mon. 821, 823; Leo Gram. 460-2; Cedr. 1.943, 958, 965, 971, 979, 980, 981.
68. Bardas/Vard, *Str. Macedoniae(?)*: Geo. Mon. 818; Leo Gram. 458.
69. Bardas/Vard, at Court: Sym. Mag. 678.
70. Bardas/Vard (Pr. Mamikonean?), at Court: Sym. Mag. 678; Geo. Mon. 837; Theod. Melit. 170; cf. Adontz 79-80.
71. ***Basil (Pr. Mamikonean?) 'the Macedonian', *Strator, Protostr., Patr., Mag. Paracoemomenus*: Th. Cont. 206, 207, 231, 237; Sym. Mag. 675; Geo. Mon. 827; Leo Gram. 465, 466. ***867-886; co-Emp. 866.

72. Constantine Toxaras Tzipharites, at Court: Genes. 4.106; Sym. Mag. 678, 688; Geo. Mon. 830, 937, 940; Leo Gram. 465, 469.
73. Gordyles/Garjoyl, *Str. Maced.*: Geo. Mon. 818; Leo Gram. 458.
74. George Peganes, *Patr., Com. Obsequ.*: Th. Cont. 240-1; Sym. Mag. 683; Leo Gram. 467; Cedr. 1.1000, 1001, 1005.
75. John 'the Chaldian,' *Str. Chaldiae*: Sym. Mag. 678, 685, 687; Geo. Mon. 830; Leo Gram. 465, 469.
76. Marianus (Pr. Mamikonean), *Praef. Urbis*: Sym. Mag. 687; Geo. Mon. 839.
77. Marianus (Pr. Mamikonean?), *Dom. Sch.*: Sym. Mag. 678, 688; Geo. Mon. 830, 840; Leo Gram. 465; Theod. Melit. 170; *De cerim.* 2.42(374).
78. N. (Pr. Mamikonean), s. of Caesar Bardas, *Monostr. Occid.*: Sym. Mag. 665.
79. Petronas (Pr. Mamikonean?).
80. Symbatus/Smbat (Pr. Mamikonean?), at Court: Geo. Mon. 837; Theod. Melit. 170; *De cerim.* 2.42 (374).
80. Symbatus/Smbat (Pr. Bagratuni?), *Patr., Log. Drom.*: Th. Cont. 205, 237-8, 263; Genes. 4.106 (Σαββάτιος); Sym. Mag. 676, 678, 680; Geo. Mon. 828, 830, 833, 834; Leo Gram. 464, 467; Cedr. 1.980, 999, 1000, 1001, 1005.
81. Theophilus (Theophilites) Παυσεύμενος, at Court: Th. Cont. 224-26, 229; Genes. 4.109; Sym. Mag. 676, 678, 680; Geo. Mon. 816-17, 820-21; Leo Gram. 458; Cedr. 1.984-92. (συγγενής of 67)
82. Tzantzes, *Str. Maced.*: Geo. Mon. 819; Leo Gram. 459; cf. Adontz 54-55.

temp. Basil I, 867-886

83. Alexius (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Str. Cypri: De them.* 15.
84. Angurines Azotus/Ašot, Gen.: *De them.* 12.
85. Baanes/Vahan, *Patr., Praepositus S. Cubiculi, Sacellarius*: Geo. Mon. 840; Leo Gram. 470; *De cerim.* 1 App. 289.
86. Bardas/Vard, s. of Apostypes: Th. Cont. 307.
87. Bartzapedon/Varč'apet, *Manglabites*: Th. Cont. 307.
88. Basil (Pr. Mamikonean?), *Rector*: Geo. Mon. 837. (s. of 70)
89. Curticius/K'urdik, ex-Pr. of Locana, Gen.: Th. Cont. 268, 358, 383; Geo. Mon. 853, 876; Leo Gram. 477, 489; Cedr. 1.1007, 1054; 2.280.
90. David, s. of Apostypes: Th. Cont. 307.
91. John Curcuas/Gurgen, *Dom. Hicanatorum*: Th. Cont. 277, 426; Geo. Mon. 847; Leo Gram. 474.
92. John (II) Curcuas/Gurgen, *Protovestiarius*: Geo. Mon. 847; Leo Gram. 474.
93. Leo Apostypes, *Str. Thraciae & Maced.*: Th. Cont. 305, 308; Cedr. 1.1031. (fath. of 86)
- (77) Marianus (Pr. Mamikonean?).
94. Melias/Mleh, *Patr., Mag., Turmarch. Euphratiae Trypiae, Str. Lycandi: De adm. imp.* 50.138, 145, 152, 154, 162, 164; *De them.* 12; Cedr. 1.1030; 2.285, 311.
95. Procopius (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Patr.*: Th. Cont. 358; Geo. Mon. 853; Leo Gram. 477; Cedr. 1.1031, 1032.
96. N. Babutzicus: Sym. Mag. 699; Geo. Mon. 847; Leo Gram. 474.
97. Romanus Curcuas/Gurgen, *Patr.*: Cedr. 1.1013; 2.318, 405.
98. Stylianus Zautzes, *Hetaer., Mag., Log. Drom., Basileopator*: Th. Cont. 354, 357, 359, 362; Sym. Mag. 701; Geo. Mon. 846-7, 849, 852, 853, 856; Leo Gram. 473, 475, 477, 478; Cedr. 1.1050, 1053; *Vit. Euthym.* (De Boor) 6.

99. Sympathicius/Smbat(ik), *Protospath.*: Trinchera, *Syll. graec. membr.* 2.3; D. C. G. Heimbach, ed. *Basilic.* VI (Leipzig 1870) 110.

temp. Leo VI - Alexander, 886-913

100. Baasacius/Vasak, *Clisurarch. Larissae*: *De adm. imp.* 50.139, 142, 148.
 101. Bardas/Vard (Pr. Kamsarakan?), *Mag.*: Th. Cont. 175.
 102. Basil, *ἐπελέκτης* of the Emp.: Cedr. 1.1058. (*ἀνεπίος* of 98)
 103. Christopher Tzanizes, *Protovest.*: Cedr. 1.1057, 1059.
 104. Constantine Lips, *Patr.*, *Protospath.*, *Dom. Hypuragiae*: Th. Cont. 371, 384, 389; Sym. Mag. 724; Geo. Mon. 866, 877, 881, 882; Leo Gram. 484, 489, 492; Cedr. 2.281, 285, 286; *De adm. imp.* 43.43, 55, 59, 61, 70, 74.
 105. Cricoricus/Grigorik (Gregory): *De adm. imp.* 50.139. (br. of 100)
 (89) Curticius/K^curdik, ex-Pr. of Locana.
 106. George (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, at Court: Th. Cont. 369; Geo. Mon. 863; Leo Gram. 483; Cedr. 1.1064.
 107. Gregory Iberitzes, *Dom. Sch.*: Th. Cont. 372, 382-83; Geo. Mon. 867; Leo Gram. 484; Cedr. 1.1067.
 108. Iachmucas of Digisene, *Str. Nicopoleos*: *De adm. imp.* 50.121, 123; cf. *De them.* 9.
 109. Ismael, *Clisurarch. Symposii*: *De adm. imp.* 50.140, 144, 147.
 110. John Zautzes, *Drung. Vigl.*: Geo. Mon. 856; Leo Gram. 478, 480; Cedr. 1.1058.
 111. Leo, s. of Symbatices/Smbat(ik), 'the Armenian,' *Protospath.*, *Str. Cypr.*, *Topolereites*: *De adm. imp.* 51.72, 74, 104, 126, 129; *De cerim.* 2.43(379).
 112. Leo, s. of Zautzes, *Mag.*: Cedr. 1.1058.
 113. Manuen, ex-Pr. of the Mamikonids and of Digisene, *Protospath.*: *De adm. imp.* 50.115, 118, 120.
 (94) Melias/Mleh.
 114. Nicetas Sclerus, *Patr.*: Th. Cont. 358; Geo. Mon. 853; Leo Gram. 477, 491; Cedr. 1.1055.
 115. Pancratucas/Bagrat(uk) (Pr. Mamikonean) of Digisene, *Dom. Hican.*, *Str. Bucell.*: *De adm. imp.* 50.121, 122; *De them.* 9; Th. Cont. 387; Sym. Mag. 723; Geo. Mon. 880; Leo Gram. 497; Cedr. 2.284.
 116. Pazunes: *De adm. imp.* 50.140. (br. of 100)
 (95) Procopius (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites.
 (97) Romanus Curcuas/Gurgen.
 117. Sinutes, *Chart. Drom.*: *De adm. imp.* 43.36, 41, 47.
 118. Stephen (Pr. Kamsarakan?), *Patr.*, *Mag.*, Regent: Th. Cont. 173, 175, 354, 381, 398; Sym. Mag. 681; Geo. Mon. 850-51; Leo Gram. 475, 491, 492, 493, 497; Cedr. 1.1077; 2.297.
 (98) Stylianus Zautzes.
 119. Stylianus (II) Zautzes, at Court: Leo Gram. 480.
 (99) Sympathicius/Smbat(ik)
 120. Theodore, s. of Pancrates/Bagarat (Basilaces), *Protospath.*: *De adm. imp.* 43.41; *De cerim.* 2.43(379); John Kathol. 284-5; cf. Toumanoff, *Bagr. of Iberia* 34.
 121. Tzautzes, at Court: Th. Cont. 360; Sym. Mag. 702; Geo. Mon. 856; Leo Gram. 478. (s. of 98)

122. Abessalom (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, at Court: Th. Cont. 384; Geo. Mon. 876; Cedr. 2.281.
123. Adrian, *Patr.*: Th. Cont. 423; Sym. Mag. 746; Geo. Mon. 914; Leo Gram. 506; Cedr. 2.316.
124. Adrian 'the Chaldian': Th. Cont. 404; Sym. Mag. 734; Geo. Mon. 896; Leo Gram. 499; Cedr. 2.302.
125. Alexius (Pr. Mamikonean) Musele/Mušel, *Patr.*, *Drung.*: Th. Cont. 401; Sym. Mag. 733; Geo. Mon. 893-4; Leo Gram. 498.
126. Arotas (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Protospath.*, *Str. Pelop.*, *Str. Hellados*: *De adm. imp.* 50.34, 39, 47, 52, 53.
127. Arsenius, *Protospath.*, *Manglab.*: *De adm. imp.* 51.72, 130; Th. Cont. 399. (s. of 111)
- (101) Bardas/Vard (Pr. Kamsarakan?).
128. Bardas/Vard Platypodes, *Protospath.*, *Str. Pelop.*: *De adm. imp.* 50.54, 57.
129. Basil Nothus Lecapenus, *Protopost.*, *Patr.*, *Paracoem.*: Th. Cont. 442, 461, 468; Sym. Mag. 754; *De adm. imp.* 50.233; Leo Diac. 3.7; 4.1; Cedr. 2.350; Psellus, *Chron.* 1.3, 19-21.
130. ***Christopher Lecapenus, *Hetaer.*: Th. Cont. 395. Co-Emp. of No. 140, 921-931.
131. Constantine, s. of Lips, *Patr.*, *Anthyp.*, *Magn. Hetaer.*: *De adm. imp.* 43.43; Adontz 224 (s. of 104?).
132. John Curcuas/Gurgen, *Drung. Vigil.*, *Dom. Sch.*, *Mag.*, *Str. Anat.*: Th. Cont. 397, 404, 415, 426, 427, 428, 429, 441, 443; Sym. Mag. 731, 734, 747; Geo. Mon. 890, 896, 907, 915, 916, 923; Leo Gram. 496, 499; *De adm. imp.* 45.56, 59, 143, 162; Cedr. 2.297, 302, 316.
133. Manuel Curtices/K'urdik, *Patr.*, *Drung. Vigil.*: Th. Cont. 435, 436; Sym. Mag. 752; Geo. Mon. 917; Leo Gram. 509; Cedr. 2.327.
- (94) Melias/Mleh.
134. Michael Toxaras, at Court: Th. Cont. 388; Sym. Mag. 724; Geo. Mon. 881; Leo Gram. 490; Cedr. 2.285.
135. N.(Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Protospath.*, *Str. Calabriae*: *De adm. imp.* 43.137, 170, 172, 177; Cedr. 2.357-8.
136. Nicholas (Pr. Bagratuni) Tornices/T'ornik: *De cerim.* 1.96(252); Cedr. 2.324.
- (115) Pancratucas/Bagrat(uk) of Digisene.
137. Pantherius, *Patr.*, *Dom. Sch.*: Th. Cont. 429; Geo. Mon. 917; Leo Gram. 507; Cedr. 2.318. (*συγγενής* of 140)
138. Paschal (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Protospath.*, *Str. Longobardiae*: Th. Cont. 431; Sym. Mag. 748; Geo. Mon. 917; Leo Gram. 507; *De cerim.* 1.96(252); Leo Diac. 3.7; Cedr. 2.319, 342.
139. Photinus Platypodes: Th. Cont. 401.
- (97) Romanus Curcuas/Gurgen.
140. ***Romanus Lecapenus, *Str. Sami*, *Drung.*, *Basileop.*, *Caesar*: Th. Cont. 391, 395, 397; Sym. Mag. 724, 725; Geo. Mon. 890; Leo Gram. 492, 495; Cedr. 2.286, 287. ***920-944.
141. Romanus (Pr. Mamikonean) Musele/Mušel, *Mag.*, *Com. Obsequ.*: Th. Cont. 443; Cedr. 2.342, 343.
- (118) Stephen (Pr. Kamsarakan?).

142. Tatzates/Tačat, *Mag.*: Th. Cont. 404 (*Τατζάκης*); Sym. Mag. 734; Geo. Mon. 896 (*Τζάντης*); Leo Gram. 499; Cedr. 2.302.
- (120) Theodore, s. of Pancrates/Bagarat (Basilaces).
143. Theophilus Curcuas/Gurgen, *Patr.*, *Mag.*, *Str. Chald.*, *Str. Theodosiopoleos*, *Dom. Sch.*: Th. Cont. 428; *De adm. imp.* 45.59, 134, 140; Cedr. 2.318.
144. Theophylactus, *Patr.*, *Com. Stabuli*, *Mag.*: *De adm. imp.* 43.155; Th. Cont. 397; Sym. Mag. 731; Geo. Mon. 890. (*συγγενής* of 140)
145. Thomas Maniaces, *Patr.*, *Log. Drom.*: Th. Cont. 198; Sym. Mag. 681; Geo. Mon. 835; Leo Gram. 468.

lemp. Romanus II - Basil II, 959-1025

146. Asotius/Ašot (Pr. Bagratuni) Taronites, *Protospath.*, *Mag.*: Asolik 3.33, 34; Cedr. 2.449, 451.
147. Bardas/Vard, s. of Lips, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.342.
148. Bardas/Vard Parsacutenus, *Mag.*: Leo Diac. 10.7.
149. **Bardas/Vard Sclerus, *Str. Mesopotamiae*, *Protospath.*, *Mag.*, *Dom. Sch.*: Leo Diac. 6.11, 13; 7.3, 5, 8; 8.7; 10.7; Cedr. 2.384, 417. **976-979, 987.
- (129) Basil Nothus Lecapenus.
150. Basil Machetarius/Mxit'ar, *Vestes*, *Catepano*, *Melitenes & Lycandi*: seal, Adontz 137, 139-140.
151. Constantine Dalassenus, *Patr.*, *Dux Ant.*, *Anthyp.*: Cedr. 2.484, 492, 493, 506-11, 521; Yahya (Rosen) 66, 49, 56; Psellus, *Chron.* 6.13; Zonaras 17.14.
152. Constantine Sclerus, *Patr.*: Leo Diac. 7.3; Cedr. 2.392.
153. Cricoricus/Grigorik (Gregory) II, ex-Pr. of Taraun/Taronites, *Mag.*, *Str. Thessalonicae*: Asol. 3.33; Cedr. 2.447, 449; Yahya(R) 24.
154. Damian Dalassenus, *Patr.*, *Dux Ant.*: Asol. 3.37; Yahya(R) 31-33, 39; Cedr. 2.448.
155. (George) Melias/Mleh, (*Protospath.*), *Dom. Sch.*: Matt. Edess. 1.13; seal, Adontz 139.
156. Gregory Cecaumenus, *Patr.*, *Str. Hell. & Lariss.*: Cecaumenus, *Strat.* 169, 170; cf. P. Lemerle, *Prolég. à une éd. . . . de Kékauménos*.
157. John Curcuas/Gurgen, *Mag.*: Leo Diac. 7.9; Cedr. 2.405.
158. ***John Tzimisce Curcuas/Gurgen, *Dom. Sch. Orient.*, *Patr.*, *Str. Anat.*, *Mag.*: Leo Diac. 3.2, 3, 4, 6, 8; 4.2; 5.5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 6.1; Cedr. 2.347, 348, 360, 375, 376; Matt. Edess. 1.15. ***969-976.
159. Michael Burtzes, *Patr.*, *Dux Ant.*: Bryenn. 365-367; Yahya (PO) 814-817; Leo Diac. 5.6; Cedr. 2.365, 366, 367, 375, 425, 429.
160. Michael Curtices/K'urdik, *Drung.*: Cedr. 2.424, 427.
161. N. Curcuas/Gurgen, *Patr.*, *Catep. Barii*: Lupus *Protospath. a.* 1009, 1010.
162. Nicephorus Parsacutenus, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.434. (br. of 148?)
163. Pancratius/Bagarat (Pr. Bagratuni) Taronites, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.375.
164. Romanus (Pr. Bagratuni) Taronites, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.425.
- (141) Romanus (Pr. Mamikonean) Musele/Mušel.
165. Rupenes/Ruben, *Str. Hell. & Lariss.*: Cedr. 2.475; cf. Adontz 177-95.
166. Sachacius Brachmanus/Sahak (Isaac) Vahram, *ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν δεήσεων*: Cedr. 2.422; *Vit. Nic. ep. Mil. (An. Boll. 14)* 144; Yahya (PO) 822, 825, 829; cf. Adontz 147-52.
167. Theodorocanus, *Patr.*, *Str. Philippopoleos*: Cedr. 2.452, 454, 455.

168. Theophylactus Dalassenus, *Protospath.*, *Drung.*, *Str. Anat.*: Cedr. 2.477-8; Yahya(R) 63-4.
 169. Tzitzicius/Jojik, *Str. Dorystoli*: Cedr. 2.465.
- temp. Constantine VIII to the end of the Basilids, 1025-56*
170. Adrian Dalassenus: Cedr. 2.521; Bryenn. 19.
 171. Barasbatze/Varaz-Vač'e, *Protostr.*, *Str. Edess.*: Cedr. 2.488, 520.
 172. Basil Sclerus, *Patr.*, *Mag.*: Cedr. 2.483, 501-502; Psellus, *Chron.* 6.15.
 173. Basil Theodorocanus, *Patr.*, *Mag.*, *Catep. Longob.*: Cedr. 2.523, 531, 552, 553; Attaliat. 21; Lupis *Protospath.* a. 1043.
 174. Catacalo Cecaumenus/Kamen, *Vest.*, *Protospath.*, *Mag.*, *Catep. Iberiae*, *Dux Ant.*, *Curop.*: Aristaces 10(63), 13(86); Matt. Edess. 1.70, 71, 73; Cedr. 2.523, 524, 555, 574, 578, 597, 598, 599, 615, 623, 630, 637; Psellus, *Chron.* 7.3.
 175. Constantine Burtzes, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.481.
 - (151) Constantine Dalassenus.
 176. George Burtzes, at Court: Cedr. 2.488.
 177. **George Maniaces, *Protospath.*, *Mag.*, *Catep. Baspracaniae*, *Catep. Sic.*: Cedr. 2.500-1, 502, 512, 517, 520, 522-3, 524, 525, 541, 545, 547-8, 549; Psellus, *Chron.* 6.76-87; Aristaces 10(47-8); Zonaras 17.15, 22. **1043.
 178. George Theodorocanus, *Str. Sam.*: Cedr. 2.484.
 179. Gregory (Pr. Bagratuni) Taronites, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.531.
 180. **Leo (Pr. Bagratuni) Tornices/T'ornik, *Patr.*, *Vest.*, *Str. Melit. (Iber?)*: Cedr. 2.561-6; Psellus, *Chron.* 6.99-124; Attaliat. 22; Matt. Edess. 1.72; Zonaras 17.23. **1047.
 181. Leo (Contoleo) (Pr. Bagratuni) Tornices/T'ornik, *Protospath.*, *Catep. Bar.*: Lupus *Protospath.* a. 1107; cf. Adontz 252-253.
 182. Machetarius/Mxit'ar, *Drung. Vigl.*: seal, *Ech. d'Or.* 1923.347-8; Psellus in Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη* 5.352; cf. Adontz 140-1.
 183. N. (Pr. Mamikonean) Crinites, *Catep. Melit.*: Mich. Syr. (Ch) 3.164 (*Kri- notes*).
 184. Romanus (II) Curcuas/Gurgen: Cedr. 2.483.
 185. Romanus Sclerus, *Mag.*: Cedr. 2.487, 547.
 186. Samuel Burtzes, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.601.
 187. Theophanes Dalassenus, *Patr.*: Cedr. 2.521.

The above list, which contains a number of persons left unmentioned by Adontz and Charanis, is based either on explicit statements of the sources as to the Armenian or Georgian origin of the persons involved, or on the fact of the use by some of them of typically Armenian *praenomina* (like Bagarat, Mušel, Smbat, Vard, Vardan). In the case of the House of Phocas, this assumption seems precluded by what appears to be definite testimony as to its having originated in the *partes Occidentis* (*supra*, n. 95). The case of Bardas Boilas, *Str. Chald.* (Th. Cont. 404; Sym. Mag. 734; Geo. Mon. 896; Leo Gram. 499; Cedr. 2.302) is similarly vitiated by the seemingly obvious Bulgarian origin of the family: Vryonis, *Dumb. Oaks Papers* 11.275. No. 162 is included in the list on the supposition of his being kin of No. 148.

In regard to Nos. 104 and 131, there seems indeed to have been a 'careless mistake' in Constantine Porphyrogenitus (Jenkins, *De adm. imp.* Commentary II

162-3). That the Patrician Constantine Lips (No. 104) was distinct from the Great Hetaeriarch Constantine, son of Lips (No. 131), would appear to be indicated by the way in which each is named in the sources. While the former is *Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ Λίψ* (though in the genitive, *Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ Λιβός*), the latter is, in the nominative, *Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ τοῦ Λιβός*. Constantine Porphyrogenitus appears to have fused both into one; and Adontz is undoubtedly right in supposing the latter to have been a son of the former (224). The suggestion of the Libyan origin of this family (*Dumb. Oaks Papers* 18 [1964] 257) is quite naïve; cf. Adontz 224.

APPENDIX C

HERACLIAN ONOMASTICS

It may well be asked why, if of Armenian origin, the father of the Emperor Heraclius I had a perfectly Greek name, while so many Armenians in the Imperial service are identifiable precisely by their typically Armenian names (while, it is true, others used purely Greek and Latin names [Appendix B 5, 25 etc.]?). The complexity of Caucasian onomastics in the Romano-Hellenistic world may provide an answer to this. Caucasian proper names usually passed into Greek and Latin by way of *transcription*, which involved occasional modification and a Greek or Latin termination (e.g., Mleh = *Μελλίας*; Smbat = *Συμβάτιος*). But this was not the only way. Parallely, there existed another, though much less usual, way, which was that of *translation*. Accordingly, we find the Armenian words *Siwnik'* (Siunia) *transcribed* (in the genitive) as *Συνῆς* (*De cerim.* 2.48) and *Siwnec'i* (Siunian) as *Σινούτης* (*De adm. imp.* 43.36, 41, 47) and, parallely, *Siwneac' episkopos* (Bishop of Siunia) appears *translated* (through the confusion between *Siwnik'* and *siwn* = 'column') as *ἐπίσκοπος τοῦ στύλου* (*Narratio* 86, cf. 210-11) and *Siwnec'i* as *Στυλιανός* (Peeters, 'Une sainte arménienne oubliée: sainte Marie la Jeune,' reprinted in *Recherches* I 132). The Armenian name *Mxit'ar* was usually *transcribed* as *Μαχητάριος*, but we know of an instance when it was *translated* as *Παρακλήτος* (Adontz, 'Les sceaux des Makhitar,' *Études arméno-byzantines* 140), or, in Latin, as Consolator (Pope Clement VI to Mxit'ar, Katholikos of Armenia, 29 Sept. 1351: e.g. *Enchiridion Symbolorum* ed. 32 [1963] p. 303). Another instance is the Georgian sobriquet *sparst'agan(i)*, become *Aprasit'gan* in Syriac and then *transcribed* as *Πασαγνάθης* and *translated* as *Περσογενής* (Peeters, in *Recherches* I 293-309; cf. Appendix B 21). Similarly, the Iranoid name *Pīrān*, used in Caucasia and generally *transcribed* as *Περάνιος* (Justi, *Namenbuch* 246, 252), was, in the case of an Iberian prince, *translated* as *Ultra* by Ammianus Marcellinus (27.12.16), who mistook it for the Greek *πέραν* (Peeters, *Débuts du christianisme* 39 n. 3).

It may, therefore, be conjectured that the purely Greek *Ἡράκλειος* in the case of the father of the first Heracliad Emperor, who was born in the Arsacid principality of Carenitis, in the Western Kingdom of Armenia, and whose family were relatives of the Arsacids (*supra* n. 98), was a *translation* from the original Armenian. The only name it can thus *translate* must be Vahan — usually *transcribed* as *Βαάνης* (Appendix B 6 *et al.*) — which in this case must have been under-

stood as a derivative of the pagan divine name Vahagn. The Armenian equivalent of the Iranian Vērēθraǵna, Vahagn was syncretized with Heracles. The Greek Agathangelus 141 (translated from the Armenian c. 464/468; *Studies* 16) translated as Ἡρακλῆς the Vahagn of the Armenian Agathangelus 809; Ps. Moses mentions this syncretization (2.12; cf. 1.31); and the Commagenian Orontids likewise syncretized Vērēθraǵna-Ἀρτάγνης with Heracles (*Studies* 109 n. 168). J. Karst actually equates Vahagn and Vahan (*Mythologie arméno-caucasienne et hélito-asianique* [Strasbourg/Zurich 1948] pp. 3, 5). Thus the equation Vahan = Ἡράκλειος stems from the equation Vahagn = Ἡρακλῆς.

Now, of the three princely houses of the Western Kingdom: the Arsacids of Carenitis, the Bagratids of Syspiritis, and the Mamikonids of Acilisene (*supra* n. 21), neither the Arsacids nor the Bagratids are known to have used the name Vahan (Čamčean does indeed mention a Vahan, whom he makes a son of John Aršakuni [Appendix A 2], but without showing his source; Justi, *Namenbuch* 338 No. 13). On the other hand, it was a favorite *praenomen* of the Mamikonids. This dynasty, moreover, had, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries, a predilection for the *praenomina* Gregory and David. And, interestingly enough, Heraclius I had a brother named Gregory and a son named David—the first appearance of these names among the imperial families of Constantinople. All this cannot, to be sure, be considered as a proof that the Heracliads, relatives of the Arsacids, were a Mamikonid branch, but it may contribute to the cumulative evidence for their Armenian origin.